THE Anti-Christs and Sadduces DETECTED Among a sort of QUAKERS: OR,

Caleb Pusie of *Pensilvania*, and *John Pennington*; with his Brethren of the *Second Days Meeting* at *London*, called *Quakers*, Proved *Antichrists* and *Sadduces*, out of a Printed Book lately published by them, falsly called, *A modest Account of the principal Differences in point of Doctrine*, betwixt *George Keith*, and those of the People called *Quakers* in *Pensilvania*, &c.)

Being an ANSWER to the said Book, Signed particularly by *Caleb Pusie*, but expresly recommended in Print by *John Pennington*, and approved by *the Second Days Meeting* at *London*.

With some few Remarks on *John Penningtons* late Book, entitled, *The People called Quakers cleared*, &c. And *Geo. Whitehead* his Postscript, shewing some of their gross Perversions, Falsehoods, and Groundless Calumnies against *G. K.*

And a *POSTSCRIPT*,

Containing an earnest Expostulation, with the most Pious and Learned Persons, whether in the Church of *England*, or among other Protestant Dissenters; and a serious Invitation unto them, to employ some of their Time and Labour, by their Pious and Learned Writings, to oppose and refute those vile Errors boldly avowed, and publickly broached in the late Printed books of some Leading Men, among a Gang, and sort of *Quakrs*.

By GEORGE KEITH.

London, Printed for the Author, and are to be sold at his House at the *Golden Ball* over-against *Red-Lyon-street* in *White-Chappel*.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY

THE

Anti-christ's and Sadduces

DETECTED,

Among a sort of QUAKERS.

IN the first place, it is fit I should give the Readers some Information who the Second Days Meeting at *London* is. It is a Meeting of the Ministry of them, called Quakers, of *William Penns* and *George Whitehead's* Party, belonging to *London*, and some of the Country that may happen to be present, who Meet at *Whitehart-Court* in *Lumbard-Street*, every Second day of the Week, and assume a Power to License and Approve of all Books that are to be Printed by any of their Party, and have approved this Book, falsely called, *A Modest Account*, and all the late (candalous Books of *Thomas Elwood* and *John Pennington*, come forth against me, and claim Authority over all other Meetings (the Yearly Meeting perhaps excepted) sending out their Circular Letters to all other Meetings in all parts of the World, as they think they have occasion, and to whom the Meetings from all places direct their Letters upon any occurrence of difference (as the Churches and Bishops of other Countries had wont to direct their Letters to *Rome*, which was the Rise of that *Roman Hierarchy*) the which Meeting may be fitly compared to the Conclave of Cardinals at *Rome*, but who is the Metropolitan of this new erected *Hierarchy* at *London*, at present, is not certainly known, as whether *W. P.* or *G. W.*

He doth acknowledg, 1st. differences in point of Doctrine. 2. Principal differences. How doth this agree with many of them called the Church Party here, who say, They do not deny *G. K's* Doctrine.

P. 8. As concerning the Sufficiency of the Light, without ſomething elſe (that he ſaith you have made ſuch a pudder about of late) for this he brings a Proof from my Book, *Light of Truth*, p. 12. and 6. where I ſay the expreſs Knowledg and Belief, *&c.* Is not univerſally of abſolute neceſſity unto Salvation, and ſo I ſay ſtill, annd ſo ſaith *R. Barclay*, whom he abuſeth as well as me, for we both frequently caution and limit the matter, ſaying the clear diſtinct expreſs Hiſtorical Knowledg is not univerſally neceſſary. See my Book, *Univerſal Grace*, p. 117. *ad Finem.* But whereas he ſtates the difference in point of Doctrine betwixt ſome in *Penſylvania*, and me, as if I ſaid, it were an Error to affirm, 'the 'Light within were ſufficient, without ſomething elſe, which I never ſo ſaid, nor thought, for the Light within, is ſufficient without, not only ſomething elſe, but without thouſands of ſomethings elſe; But my aſſertion was and is, 'The Light within is not ſufficient to Salvation without 'ſomething elſe, which they blaming, they ought to hold the contradictory aſſertion, *viz.* The Light within is ſufficient to Salvation, without any thing elſe, for two contradictories are not betwixt two particulars, but one particular, and another Univerſal; now ſeeing they hold, 'that the Light within 'is ſufficient without any thing elſe, it is plain they Exclude the Man Chriſt without us, and his Death, *&c.* from being concerned in our Salvation.

Of Chriſt Crucified.

P. 8. He falſely forges me to ſay, It is a real degree of Blaſphemy to ſay this Light cannot make ſatisfaction for ſins paſt, citing pag. 38. 39. *Refutation.* See the place, I have no ſuch words, but plain contrary. I ſay, *Refut.* p. 42. 43. Neither is the Saints greateſt inward Righteouſneſs or Holineſs wrought in them by the Spirit of God, an Atonement or Propitiation for their ſins, but Chriſt alone, who Dyed for us, the juſt for the unjuſt.

P. 9. He cites my Book, *Looking-glaſs for Proteſtants*, p. 10. That Magiſtrates may Preach, which he thinks a contradiction to my late Teſtimony with Friends in *Penſylvania*, that Friends of the Miniſtry ſhould not meddle to be Juſtices and Judges in Criminal Caſes; but this is no contradiction, for it is one thing occationally to Preach, or Teach, or Exhort, as any Chriſtian can do, and another to exerciſe the Office or Function of a Miniſter of the Goſpel of Peace one day, that ſaith, Reſiſt not Evil, and our Weapons are not Carnal, and another day to hang Men for Murder, *&c.* Which ſcarce any that profeſs to be Miniſters do in *Chriſtendom*, but the Quakers in *America.*

P. 9. That I ſay of Chriſts Body now in Heaven, *It being no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood, and Bones, but a pure ethereal, or Heavenly Body.* This he brings to prove a contradiction to my ſelf, leaving out the foregoing words, — *Which remaineth the ſame in Subſtance, that it was on Earth*, &c. So that by my ſaying, it being no more a Body of Fleſh and Blood, I mean it in the Apoſtles ſenſe, 1 *Cor.* 15. *Fleſh and Blood cannot inherit*, &c. See my words cited by himſelf, p. 10. a Teſtimony againſt the falſe and abſurd Op. The Fleſh that is mortal, groſs and corruptible, is not the Fleſh that ſhall be raiſed up immortal and incorruptible.

Citing Way caſt up, p. 113. falſe quot. true quot. p. 131.

P. 12.

P. 12. He makes me to contradict my self in saying, Presb. and Indep. p. 133. The Express Knowledg of Christ, his becoming Man, and suffering, was positively denied to be of necessity to Salvation, but now I furiously quarrel with Friends about it, that it is. But his fallacy lyeth in this, that I say, the express Knowledg is not *universally* necessary, but some knowledg, if not express, yet implicit, is, and this is no Contradiction.

P. 13. He Argues from my Book, *The Light of Truth*, p. 8. That the Light within is the only Christ, and he saith, p. 14. the word only admits of nothing else, than Light, Power and Spirit within.

Answ. 1. Here it is manifest, he placeth all on the Light within, so that the man Christ Jesus of *Nazareth* without us, is nothing of Christ; but as his Assertion, and Consequence is Blasphemous, so it follows not from my words; for as I then said, so I still say, Christ is but one, and there are not two Christs, one within, and another without; but it will not follow, that there is nothing of Christ without us, but what is within us. Suppose *Caleb Pusey*'s Head is without the House, and some, or most of his Body is within the House, as is possible, the *Caleb Pusey* that is within, is the same that is without, yet there is something of him without, that is not within, it is the same Body of Water in the Complex, that is in the *Thames*, and in the Sea, yet it follows not that there is nothing of the great and vast Body of Water, but what is within the *Thames*. But when Men that have neither Learning, nor good Exercise of Human Reason, will meddle to Dispute, we see how ignorant they prove themselves to be in the face of the World, or how they expose themselves in Print, neither to be true Christians, nor Men of true Reason; he had better kept with working at his Mill, being by profession a Miller, than entes into a Dispute of matters wherein he is so grosly ignorant.

But seeing the Second Days Meeting at *London* hath countenanced his Book, and the Quakers generally at *London* allow it to be Sold next door to their Meeting-house in *Grace-Church-street*, they make his ignorance, unbelief, Saducism and Antichristian Doctrine to be theirs.

And seeing my Book, called, *The Light of Truth*, in Answer to *R. Gordon*, was approved by the Second Days Meeting, and that he would infer from my words, That Jesus of *Nazareth* cannot be something else than the Light, Power and Spirit within, it is plain, that it is both their Sense and his, that Jesus of *Nazareth* is nothing at all of Christ without us, which is a plain contradiction to themselves, and to himself in his following words. But no such consequence doth really follow from my words.

P. 17. He so mingles my words with his own, that no man can distinguish the one from the other, but the Reader that doth not compare my words in my own Book, with his Citations, would think them to be mine, for whereas my words are in the pag. cited by him.—— For whereas thou not only affirms that Salvation and Justification hath a necessary respect to Christ his taking on him the form of a Servant, or Man in the outward, and humbling himself therein, even to the outward Death, (which we also grant, God having

having ſo ordered it to be) &c. He makes as if I ſaid, (his words are for as *G. K.* ſaith) the Lord having ordained it ſo to be, how can or dare we ſay therefore, that he was, or is not ſufficient, by his Light, Power and Spirit, to ſave without ſomething elſe. But ſee Reader his Forgery, I ſay no ſuch words, but my words are a plain contradiction, by neceſſary conſequence to his preſumptuous aſſertion, for ſeeing God had Ordained it ſo to be (as I have ſaid) that our Salvation and Juſtification hath a neceſſary reſpect to Chriſt his taking on him the form of a Servant in the outward, therefore it evidently followeth, that God could not ſave us without reſpect to the Man Chriſt in the outward, otherwiſe he could or ſhould contradict his own Ordination; but as God cannot lye, ſo nor can he contradict his own Counſel and Ordination, and therefore the preſumption is his and not mine. And ſeeing they grant that God in the Man Chriſt without us, cannot ſave us without an inward work of his Power and Spirit within us, to Regenerate and Sanctify us, which is a Truth, and yet is no Reflection on his Sufficiency and Omnipotency, ſo nor is it any reflection on him, that God in us cannot ſave us without the Man Chriſt without us, for he is as truly God without us, and incomparably more manifeſt in the Man Chriſt without us, than in us.

P. 19. He ſaith, I expoſed Friends to the World in Print, for retaking a Sloop, without ever admoniſhing them before hand for it, and that when I reckoned my ſelf an Elder in the Church among them.

Anſw. This is a groſs falſhood and Forgery, I Printed nothing about their retaking a Sloop, till a conſiderable time, after 28 of the Miniſters had Excommunicated me at *Philadelphia*; to which Sentence, ſome that gave a Commiſſion to retake the ſloop by force of Arms, did put their hands, and all the reſt conſented, and they have diſowned me to be any Member of their Church, and how then could I own my ſelf to be any of them? which I did not. So that this whole paſſage is falſe, and a wilful piece of Forgery.

P. 20. He alſo alledgeth, That I came to them, and commended them for what they did, and ſaid, It was very well done, adding, methinks you ſhould conſider theſe things.

Anſw. But what proof brings he for his Affirmation? None at all, and he having ſufficiently diſcovered his groſs forgery in other things, rendreth his credit of no value in this; and I well remember that at the retaking of the Sloop, I was not in the Province; but that I commended them that they had done well, to ſend Armed men to retake the Sloop, I affirm is an abſolute forgery, for it never was my Principle, ſince I was called a Quaker, and I have many to bear me witneſs, that it hath been my conſtant Principle that Friends ſhould not in any caſe uſe the Carnal Sword; and the ſame Principle *Robert Barclay*, in his Apology, hath largely aſſerted, and whom we have quoted, and it is well known that many of greateſt note among the Quakers hath declared the ſame. And ſuppoſe I did ſay, that they who did retake the Sloop did well, which I do not remember, all this might have been well ſaid without any contradiction, or equivocation, for it was *Peter Boſſe*, and one or two more with him in a little Boat, having neither Gun, Sword nor Spear, that

retooke

retook the Sloop, when a great many Armed Men, that filled ſeveral Boats ſtood off at a diſtance, and were afraid to come within ſhot, and ſo the praiſe of that work belonged to him, and not to them, and the Magiſtrates did ill reward him, for they not long after Fined him 6 Pounds, and put him in Priſon for ſome paſſages writ to *Sam. Jennings* in a private Letter, and kept him in Priſon 20 miles remote from his Family, till the Magiſtrates that were Quakers, and had caſt him into Priſon, were turned out of the Government by *G. Fletcher*, who was made Governour of *Penſilvania*, by a Commiſſion from K. *William* and Queen *Mary*, and how ſoon he came unto the Government, he Releaſed him, after inquiry, that they had nothing juſtly againſt him. See a further Account of this in the printed Tryal of *G. K. T. B.* and *Peter Boſſe*, firſt printed at *Philadelphia*, and Reprinted at *London*.

And concerning *Peter Boſſe* his retaking the Sloop without Force of Arms, *John Homes*, a Baptiſt Teacher, and either then, or ſome time not long after a Juſtice of Peace (whoſe Name, and Chriſtian Behaviour is mentioned in the ſaid printed Tryal, in refuſing to give Judgment againſt *G. K.* whithout hearing) did write ſome *Engliſh* Verſes, which are theſe following.

*One * Quaker, Maſter of a Boat,*
With our ſmall Fleet along did Float,
And tho he us'd not Sword nor Gun,
Yet with his Oars and with his Tongue.
He plaid his part exceeding well,
As theſe who were with him, can tell.

* That was *Peter Boſſe*.

Note, Theſe few Lines are but a ſmall part of many more *Engliſh* Verſes made by the ſaid *John Homes*, that he ſpread abroad, having this Title, *The Fighting Quakers Expedition in* Penſilv.

P. 22. Whereas he makes me to ſay, in one Book, The expreſs knowledg of Chriſt's Death and Sufferings, as Man in the outward, is not univerſally neceſſary to Salvation: And in another, That the expreſs Knowledg of Chriſt's Death, is univerſally neceſſary.

Anſw. In this he uſeth (after his manner) groſs deceit, and greatly abuſeth his Reader and me alſo, for tho he citeth a paſſage in one of my Books, to prove the firſt, *viz. Preſh. and Indep. Vif.* p. 133. Yet he cites no paſſage in any of my Books, for the ſecond, that I can find, tho I have narrowly ſearched, but the only proof I can find he brings is, that he ſaith, p. 15. I furiouſly quarrel with Friends about it, and confeſs it to be a main matter of Controverſy with Friends there. This is falſe, I never had any Controverſy with any, whether the expreſs Knowledg and Faith of Chriſt's Death and Sufferings be univerſally neceſſary to Man's Salvation, ſo as neceſſary to be had by all and every one before Death. But the true ſtate of the Queſtion betwixt them and me, was and is, Whether the expreſs Knowledg and Faith of Chriſt's Death and Sufferings, *&c.* be not neceſſary to Salvation, to all Profeſſing Chriſtianity, and who have the opportunity and help of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, whereby to receive it, the Holy Spirit inwardly co-operating to produce the Faith of it in them that hear or

read

read that Doctrine, as delivered in the Holy Scriptures; and whether the Doctrine of Christ should not be Preached, as he Died for our Sins, and rose again, &c. as a main Doctrine of the Christian Religion in order to Salvation! For I have always distinguished betwixt simple Heathens or Gentiles, who have not the occasion to have the Faith outwardly Preached, and those in *Christendom* under a Christian Profession, who have the occasion to hear it Preached; to the former I have said, the express Knowledg and Faith of that Doctrine is not necessary, tho the implicit in some degree is, but how much, or what measure or degree of it is universally necessary I have never affirmed? And that this is the true state of the question betwixt my Adversaries and me, I need go no further for a Proof than from my present Adversary, who makes it a great Error in me, to say, the Light within is not sufficient to Salvation, without something else; for if that be false, the contradictory is true, *viz.* The Light within is sufficient to Salvation, without any thing else, but the Death and Sufferings of Christ, and his Blood outwardly shed, and his Intercession for us in Heaven without us, are all something else, and if the Light within be sufficient without all these, then there is no need to believe or Preach any of them, but only and alone the Light within.

P. 24. He spends his Pages from 24. to 28. in some base insinuations against me, about the 12 Revolutions, and telling some Stories, most of which are absolutely false (and that little that's true, in any of them, is not fairly, nor duly related) and which he brought no proof for, but his own forfeited Credit, or the report of such as are of as ill Credit as himself, and known to have been prejudiced Persons against me.

P. 29. What he saith of my Praising the Quaker's Doctrine to *Cotton Mather* in *New-England*, was before that Party rose up against me in *Pensilvania*, to oppose the same Doctrine I delivered in my Printed Books, in answer to *Cotton Mather*, which Doctrine they seemed to own, and all my former Books were Approved of by most of the Ministers of best note in *Pensilvania*, that were writ, in Answer to *Cotton Mather*, and his Brethren in *New-England*, before they were Printed; so that it was a most astonishing thing to me to find how suddenly they who professed to own the Doctrine contained in these Books, turned against the very same Doctrine, after *W. Stockdale* had accused me, of Preaching two Christs, because I Preached Faith in Christ without, and in Christ within, therefore this sudden Alteration began in them, and until I came to *England*, (and found the greatest part of their Teachers here in *England*, and particularly *G. Whitehead*, and *W. Penn*, to favour and support those in *Pensilvania*, whom I have sufficiently detected guilty of vile Errors) I had but too good an Esteem for them, wherein I confess I was mistaken; and this put me on a further search into their Books, which formerly I did not much Read (and many of them not at all) and what I did Read, I did not so well consider; and upon my further search, I found sufficient

ficient cauſe to change my Judgment concerning theſe Men. But none can charge it on me, that either by word or writing I ever agreed with them in thoſe vile Errors, which ſince I have diſcovered and reprehended in them, ſo that this is no change or contradiction in any Doctrine or Principle of Faith, and what change of Judgment I have of theſe Men, they have the like of me, and will readily confeſs they have been as greatly miſtaken in me, as I have been in them; and therefore they can have no advantage againſt me in that reſpect.

And whereas he Inſinuateth, pag. 24. 25, 26. That I have dropt here and there ſome paſſages in my late Books, from which they cannot but conclude, That either I did intend to conform Friends to ſome Doctrine, of which, by what follows, the Doctrine of the 12 Revolutions may be ſuppoſed to be not the leaſt in his Eye, or elſe to ſeparate from them. Some of which expreſſions he mentions out of my late Books Printed in *Penſilvania*, all which were generally approved by Friends of the Miniſtry, out of which he hath gathered them; and if he thinks theſe Expreſſions will prove the Doctrine of the 12 Revolutions, he ſhould have proved it by poſitive Arguments, and not give ſimple Queries for Arguments; all which I could eaſily Anſwer, without the Doctrine of the 12 Revolutions, but that I have no mind to anſwer his curioſity, or gratify ſuch a prejudiced Adverſary; and he might much rather query, whether G. *F.* did not hold the Doctrine of the Revolutions, that hath ſaid in ſome of his Printed Books, before Languages were; he was; and his Charging the Blood of many that were ſlain above a thouſand Years ago upon the People living in his time, in the City of *Leichfield*, as he declareth in his Journal, and how he went in Blood a great way, and was commanded to pull off his Shoes, *&c.* This and ſome other like paſſages has occaſioned ſome to think *G. F.* favoured the Revolutions, but I do not ſay he did. And whether the Diſciples did not hold that Doctrine, that ſaid, *Maſter, who hath ſinned, this Man, or his Parents, that he was born blind*; and many other places of Scripture there are on which he might as much and much more query concerning the Revolutions, as any expreſſions he hath mentioned of mine, as well as he might query, concerning the Revolutions, all Friends generally who hold, That God hath given to every one a day of Viſitation, wherein he may be ſaved, and that a Time of God's long ſuffering is extended to every one wherein he may repent and be Converted, ſeeing many Dye, in the Morning, as it were of their Age, without all ſigns of Converſion, and have had but little Time given them, between their Birth and Death, wherein to Repent. And as to his Queſtion, If an honeſt *Indian*, or Poor infant dye without that outward Knowledg, *&c.* He quite miſſeth the matter; *I* never affirmed the abſolute neceſſity of an outward Knowledg, univerſally to Salvation, beſides that, properly all knowledg is inward, and not outward, the ſubject of it being the mind and underſtanding that is inward. And ſeeing it is certain, that there are honeſt men, both among *Indians*, and them called Chriſtians, that are not born again, *I* return his own Query upon him to Anſwer, what becomes of them

when they dye, seeing without being born again, there is no entring into the Kingdom of God, and what becomes of many called Quakers, and others, that before they dyed, had no signs that they were arrived at that high state of a sinless perfection, for tho Friends have earnestly contended for the Doctrin of Perfection, as attainable by the Grace of God in this Life, yet they have generally acknowledged, that many in whom the work of Sanctification is begun, have not as yet arrived to that state, but have many sinful imperfections remaining in them, and the Flesh lusting against the Spirit; now let him tell me, or any for him, what becomes of such when they Dye, and *I* may give him the like Answer, or some better, what becomes of honest *Indians* when they Dye, if he or they say, they who are in measure Sanctified, but not Perfected in Sanctification before they Dye, are made perfect in Holiness at the instant of Death, tho this Answer Friends have blamed, when given by those against whom they have contended, yet if they think fit to allow of it, as current now, as it will in great part end the Dispute about Perfection, and Answer the great Objection about the Popish Purgatory; so it is as valid to Answer that Question, What becomes of honest Gentiles, that before they Died, had no Knowledg nor Faith of Christ Crucified, to wit, that it is given them at the instant of Death, by the internal Operation, and illumination of the Holy Spirit: But if any say, this Answer is more alledged than Proved, *I* reply, it hath the same probability in the one case, as in the other.

P. 30. To prove my inconsistency and contrariety with my self, in the Doctrine of the Resurrection, with a most blasphemous presumption, he finds fault with Scripture Doctrine it self, and like a scoffing Sadducy, or rather Atheist, goeth to fix a contradiction on the Scripture it self; for thus he brings me in, contradicting my self, that which riseth is the mortal, that puts on immortality, and the corruptible which puts on incorruption; citing my Book, called, *A Testimony against that absurd Opinion*, p. 3. But in another place, p. 10. he citeth me, saying, *The Flesh that is mortal and corruptible is not that Flesh that shall be raised up immortal and incorruptible.* And citing my Book, called, *Truth Advanced*, he brings me saying of that which riseth, *That it is a pure noble part, that consumeth not, nor corrupteth.* And then he querieth, If that which riseth be the corruptible, p. 31. how is it, that that which riseth is incorruptible and corrupteth not again? Now Reader, I desire thee to notice how he quarrels not so much with me as with the Scriptures, to prove a contradiction in them, for my saying, *That which riseth is the Mortal that puts on Immortality, and the Corruptible that puts on Incorruption*, this is plain Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 15. 53. *For this Corruptible must put on Incorruption, and this Mortal must put on Immortality.* And for the next Citation, which he makes a contradiction to the former; it is also most plain and evident in the Scripture, *The Flesh that is Mortal and Corruptible is not that Flesh that shall be raised up Immortal and Incorruptible*; for the Scripture saith *Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 15. 50. And surely that is the Flesh that is Mortal and Corruptible. And p. 37. That which

thou

thou ſoweſt, thou ſoweſt not that Body that ſhall be; And v. 42. *It is ſown in Corruption, it is raiſed in Incorruption*, &c. And to his queſtion, which implyeth a negation and oppoſition to plain Scripture; I anſwer, That which riſeth, is incorruptible, and corrupteth not again, becauſe it is made incorruptible and immortal by the mighty Power of God, and to queſtion the immortality and incorruptibility of the Bodies of the Saints after they are raiſed from the Dead, is to ſuppoſe that they ſhall dye again, and has this neceſſary conſequence, that they ſhall ſin again, *for the wages of ſin is Death*: But this contradicts the Teſtimony of Chriſt, and all his Holy Prophets and Apoſtles, and is a plain Introduction to Epicuriſm and Atheiſm. And that I ſaid in my Book, *Truth Advanced*, which he findeth fault with, as being a contradiction, that that which riſeth is a pure, noble part that conſumeth not, nor corrupteth. This I ſay ſtill, and is no contradiction; for in my Book in that very place cited by him. p. 113. I bring a ſimilitude of a grain of Corn, which very Similitude the Scripture bringeth, to demonſtrate the Reſurreection, 1 *Cor.* 15. 37. Now all but fools and idiots know, that as there is a Grain of Corn that corrupteth, and turneth to Earth or Duſt, ſo there is another part in it, that is more Noble, that corrupteth not, but by the corruption and diſſolution of the other part, is, as it were, ſet out of Priſon, and gets a new Life and Multiplication, and as true Philoſophy and right Reaſon, and Ocular Experience teacheth, that the generation of one thing followeth the corruption of another, yet there is ſomething in the new generated thing, that was in the old corrupted thing; ſo every Husbandman, that has common ſenſe, knoweth, that his Seed which he ſoweth, doth not all periſh or rot in the ground, but a part remaineth in every Grain, that multiplieth, except in ſome extraordinary caſe, of immoderate Rains and Colds, that altogether deſtroy the Seed in the ground, as ſometimes happeneth; and then he expects no Crop, unleſs he ſow again. And that this man will needs meddle with Philoſophical matters, to confirm himſelf by falſe Notions in groſs Sadduciſm, and oppoſition to the plain Doctrine of Holy Scripture, is a lamentable caſe; and that he hath got the *Second Days Weekly Meeting* at *London*, to approve his book, in order to diſperſe it all over the Meetings of the People called *Quakers*, to corrupt and leaven them more and more into Sadduciſm and unbelief, who have been in any degree formerly corrupted, as I find too many are; and to ſpoil and defile the minds of young People, is yet more lamentable.

Page 32. He goeth on not ſo much in contending with me, as againſt the Scripture it ſelf. But that which ſeemeth mightily to vex and diſquiet his Thoughts, is, that he cannot conceive how there can be an incorruptible part lodged or placed in the corruptible body, and how the body can have any incorruptible part in it before the Reſurrection; for then he thinks it would be both corruptible and incorruptible at once; and alſo it needs not be changed from an incorruptible body to an incorruptible body? And what change is that? I queſtion if any *Sadducee* did ever argue ſo ignorantly againſt the Reſurrection of the body as this bold ignorant doth. Shall I ſend him to his Mill, or own Trade of grinding, or ſawing Timber, for further inſtruction? Doth he

Corn hath two parts in it, the one Husk, the other Meal? And hath not a Tree in it two parts, the one Wood, the other Bark? And is not the one more Noble than the other? And when a man eateth Corn with the Husk, and ſwalloweth down at leaſt a good quantity of the Husk or Bran, together with the Food that is mixed with it, doth the Husk become any part of his body? or, rather, doth it not belong to the Excrement, with other groſs parts of the food? Is there not in all food one more Noble part that becometh not Excrement, but is tranſmuted into real fleſh, in man? And did not what our Saviour eat, turn into his real fleſh, and become incorruptible, ſeeing his fleſh ſaw no corruption? And was not his body of fleſh, that did not ſee corruption, yet further changed, after his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, from a lower degree to a higher degree of Glory? Bus if it were not for the ſake of others, to whom I hope this may be ſerviceable, I ſhould think my time loſt to trace this ignorant man, that is ſo ſtubborn and preſumptuous in his ignorance, (and it might ſeem like caſting Pearl before Swine) that ſo dares to tread under his dirty feet, ſuch precious Truths of Scripture. But I hope what he arrogantly treads under, and his ignorant *Sadducean* Fraternity with him, others will gather up, and value, for the worth of them. And beſides the Scripture Similitude of Corn, I brought another Similitude in that ſame Page of my book, p. 113. comparing the mortal and corruptible body of man to a Maſs, or Mixture, that hath both Gold and Droſs in it, which Maſs is an Heterogeneous body, and is not pure Gold. And though Gold is not in the higheſt or ſtricteſt ſenſe incorruptible, yet it is the moſt incorruptible of all Metals or Minerals, or other ſuch viſible bodies; and therefore in compariſon of many other bodies, it may be ſaid to be incorruptible. Now why may it not be ſaid, of a Maſs that hath both Gold and Droſs in it, it is a corruptible body; for all Heterogeneous bodies are corruptible; and yet it hath that in it which in a certain reſpect is incorruptible; for we know not any thing that can corrupt it, ſeeing it endureth the hotteſt fire that can be put to it.

P. 33. My Similitude taken from the Soul of Man, that remains the ſame in ſubſtance, after its ſanctification, that it was before, when unſanctified, and defiled with ſin, he ſaith, is ſhort of the matter; for ſuch a change is ſurely rather a *purification* than a *tranſmutation*, even as the waſhing of a body beſmeared with dirt, when cleanſed, is a *purification*, and not a *tranſmutation*. But ſtill this ignorant preſumptuous man runs himſelf raſhly upon the ſharp pricks. Formerly he hath laboured in vain to deſtroy the felicity of the body of a Saint, and now he laboureth as much in vain to deſtroy the felicity of his Soul; that he makes the *work of Regeneration in the Soul of Man*, to be nothing elſe but a *purification from ſin*, as when a Body beſmeared with dirt, is cleanſed, that is a Purification, and not a Tranſmutation. I never heard, nor read a more ignorant and nonſenſical Aſſertion. This is like that other moſt nonſenſical Aſſertion of one of their great Preachers here at *London*, *Jacob Talner*, and a Member of their Second Days Meeting, who ſaid in a publick Conference at *Turner's-Hall*, *London*, 28. 3d. month, 1696. deſired

by

by himself, *That* Adam, *before his Fall, was neither Holy, nor Righteous, nor Wise*; and from this False Assertion, he brought an Argument, *That Spiritual Death could not be an effect of* Adam's *Sin*: Both which Assertions are flatly contrary, not only to Scripture, but to the common manner of Preaching among the People called Quakers; and this he boldly affirmed in the hearing of some hundreds, many of which were his own Party. What is this but to make the Souls of the Saints, nothing but as so many *Tabulæ Rasæ*, washed Tables without any Beautiful Colours, or lively Portraiture on them? Is then the Image of God in the Saints no positive thing, but a Freedom from sin, or a Negation of it. Is Holyness nothing but a Negation of unholiness? Is the ardent Love of God in the Saints nothing, but a meer negative of hatred of God? Doth not the Scripture plainly distinguish betwixt the finishing Transgression, and bringing in everlasting Righteousness? O wrerched ignorance! And O lamentable shame that falls upon the Second Days weekly Meeting of the People called Quakers, for approving such Antichristian Doctrine, worse than Heathenism; for I never heard that ever any Heathen Philosopher said or taught, *That Virtue in the Soul of a Man, was nothing but the absence of Vice.* The Holy Scripture doth not only Teach us, *That the Saints are washed, but Sanctified, and Transformed*, Rom. 12. 2. And what is now become of *G. Foxes* frequent Doctrine in his Preaching, and Printed Epistles, *That Christ, the Second* Adam, *brings up them that follow him, not only to the State of the First* Adam *that fell, but unto his Image that never fell, and is the Holiness of the Second* Adam, *nothing but a freedom from sin and unholiness*; he may as well say, Heat is nothing but the absence of cold, Sweet is nothing but the absence of Sower, or Bitter; Light is nothing but the absence of Darkness, and that the best things, are meer Negatives, and nonentities; and the putting on the New Man, is nothing else but the putting off the Old Man; and so at this rate the Scripture is vain and false, which doth distinguish them, as much as betwixt the putting off a filthy Garment, and the putting on a new clean Garment? But if on better consideration, he be ashamed of his rash Assertion, and come to acknowledg that the Soul by Regeneration, not only is purified from Sin, but wonderfully changed and transformed, from Natural or Animal, to Spiritual, from Earthly to Heavenly, and yet the same in Substance; let him acknowledg that the mighty Power of God, through Christ, that thus hath changed the Soul, retaining the same substance, can and will change the low Body of a Saint, and fashion it like the Glorious Body of Christ, as the Scripture plainly Testifieth, *Phil.* 3.

P. 34. But nothing will satisfy him, unless I can demonstrate how a Natural and Corruptible Substance can be turned into a Spiritual one. Well, if I can demonstrate that this actually was done, will that satisfy him? I fear his unbelief will still harden his Heart against this excellent Doctrine of holy Scripture. But however, I will try a little more to Convince him. The Food which our Saviour received into his Body, was it not before he received it, corruptible, or to use his Phrase, a Corruptible Natural Substance? Yea,

surely

ſurely it was, and what part of that Food became part of his Body and Fleſh, it was turned or changed into incorruptible, for as his Fleſh ſaw no Corruption, ſo without all doubt it is at preſent an incorruptible Subſtance, which *G. W.* after his former wrangling hath acknowledged, *Malice of the Indepen. Agent*, p. 17.

P. 34. His wrangling and quibling from his own groſs miſunderſtanding of ſome places of Scripture, helps him nothing, as that *David ſlept with his Fathers, and ſaw Corruption*, Acts 13. 36. And that of *Job, I have ſaid of Corruption, thou art my Father.* If he will take theſe Scriptures ſtrictly and literally, he muſt as much contend againſt the Immortality of the Soul, as the Reſurrection of the Body; the Mortal Body of Man is truly ſaid to be Corruptible, becauſe it conſiſts of two heterogeneous parts, the one Noble, the other ignoble, to wit, the Husk, Droſs, or Cortex, and after the Separation of the Noble, from the Ignoble, it is not corrupt, but pure, yet at the Reſurrection it is raiſed up to an higher Dignity, and made immortal and incorruptible, as it neither ſhall, nor can return to be united with that droſſy part again, and ſo is truly incorruptible, as well as immortal.

But he will not leave off, until as the Man-Eater, or *Anthropophagus*, eateth Mans Fleſh, he Eat or ſwallow up (with his devouring Throat, thereby thinking to deſtroy it) the Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the Body. And he joyneth with *Atheiſts* and *Sadducees* here in arguing againſt the Reſurrection of the Body (being the ſame in Subſtance) from the Man-Eaters. And to my Anſwer to their Objection from the Man-Eaters, he Replyeth, firſt, Repeating ſome of my words, but omitting the Explanatory part, I ſhall therefore cite them as they are in my Book, p. 118. *Truth Adv.* I ſay, *Allowing there is a great change, or renewing of the groſs material and viſible Parts of Mans Body, yet the Radical Body, or Radix, and Principal Subſtance of the Body remaineth the ſame, and is of a durable and laſting Nature; and tho it may be encreaſed in Man, while he liveth, yet it is not diminiſhed, nor the parts of it ſeparated aſunder; and tho Man-Eaters may Eat the groſs part of Man's Body, yet that more ſubtil and inviſible part they cannot, nor can that which belongeth to one be given to another; hence by way of Allegory and Metaphor, it is called Bone in Scripture*, Iſa. 66. 14. From this, moſt nonſenſically he infers, That I affirm, the Man-eaters Eat the Accidents of Man's Body, but not the Subſtance, and will needs have it the ſame, or equally abſurd with the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. But this ſort of quibling comes partly from his groſs ignorance, and partly from the perverſion and prejudice of his Spirit, for I neither ſaid, nor thought that the Man-Eaters eat only the Accidents, but I diſtinguiſhed betwixt the Radix and principal Subſtance of Man's Body, and that which was but the droſſy part, which is alſo a ſubſtance, and if he deny it to be a ſubſtance, to wit, the Droſs or Droſſy part of any Body, which is frequently ſeparated from the Noble Volatile part, by Chimical Operations, and otherwiſe, he is guilty of the Popiſh falſe Notion of Tranſubſtantiation, and not I, for the Droſs is frequently ſeparated from that more Noble Subſtance, that it was mingled with; and if he ſays that Droſs is not a Subſtance, but an Accident, then here is the

Popiſh

Popiſh Doctrine affirmed by him, with a witneſs! But let this Miller-Philoſopher, (who, as the Shoemaker, goeth beyond his Laſt, ſo goeth beyond his Sphere of Knowledge, in all his undertaking againſt theſe great Truths of the Chriſtian Faith) tell me, doth he think that a Man-eater can, properly ſpeaking, eat Iron, Silver, Gold, Lead: if he ſwallow it down, will it not go forth at the draught with the Excrement, and yet is no part of the Excrement? This is a thing uſually known, that ſome, to ſave their Gold from Robbers, have ſwallowed it down; but did they eat it? If he ſay, nay; then I ſay to him, no more can a man-eater eat that radical and principal ſubſtance of a Saints body, to make it a part of his body; for as every body has a diſtinct ſeed, ſo the Radix of every body is a diſtinct Radix.

P. 36. But behold the man's great hypocriſie, after all his ſo much contending againſt the Reſurrection of the Body, and charging the Scripture it ſelf with inconſiſtency and contradiction, yet he has the impudence to ſay, we firmly *believe there ſhall be a Reſurrection both of the Juſt and Unjuſt.* And again he ſaith, *We do not think it a neceſſary buſineſs to be curiouſly prying into the manner of it*; *Neither*, ſaith he, *do we find the Primitive Chriſtians come to any Reſult about what their Bodies ſhould be.* But this is a plain Contradiction to the holy Scripture, That the Primitive Chriſtians believed, and all true Chriſtians do now believe, which ſaith, *This corrrptible ſhall put on incorruption, and this mortal ſhall put on immortality.* Now what is this mortal? It is not the Soul which he thinks (I ſuppoſe) is not mortal; therefore it muſt be the Body. And concerning the manner of it, the Scripture is very plain and expreſs, *It is ſown natural, it is raiſed ſpiritual*; *it is ſown in corruption, it is raiſed in incorruption*; *it is ſown in weakneſs, it is raiſed in power*; *it is ſown in diſhonour, it is raiſed in honour.*

P. 36. But he goeth on ſtill, querying, 1. *If it was the common belief of the Primitive Chriſtians, that the very ſame matter and ſubſtance of this corruptible body, ſhould be the body that is raiſed, why ſhould any among themſelves, eſpecially, have asked ſuch a needleſs queſtion, as with what Body do they come?* Anſwer, Such who asked that Queſtion, were ſuch among them, that ſaid, there was no Reſurrection of the Dead, as ſuch there were, 1 *Cor.* 15. 12. *How ſay ſome among you, there is no Reſurrection of the Dead?* And therefore *Paul* thought it not needleſs to propoſe their Queſtion, on purpoſe to anſwer it; and that he might take occaſion thereby the more fully and amply to declare it.

His ſecond Queſtion is, *Would not the Apoſtle have anſwered more to the matter?* I anſwer, He anſwered very well to the matter, after he had reproved them as Fools, for querying from their unbelief, and their ignorant manner of arguing againſt it, as many do at this day, he proceeds to ſhow the manner how it is raiſed, having in the foregoing Verſes proved the Truth of the Thing, he doth next ſhow the manner of it; and the Queſtion which he anſwers, is not concerning what is raiſed, or who are raiſed, but how are the Dead raiſed, and with what manner, or with what quality of body do they

come;

come; ſo the trueſt, and beſt Tranſlation out of the *Greek*, which hath it not ἐν ποίῳ σώματι, but ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται. *i. e.* not *quo corpore, ſed quali corpore*; not with what, but with what quality of body do they come? But this their querying was a ſort of arguing againſt the thing it ſelf, of the Reſurrection. And by an Argument which they thought to take from the manner of it, they argued againſt the thing it ſelf, even as the *Sadducees* argued with Chriſt againſt the Reſurrection, from the falſe conceit of the manner of it, that they had, as if the Body were to be raiſed up in the ſame manner as it is now, ſo as to be fit for generation, and the uſe of marriage, which Chriſt confuted; ſo many at this day, and eſpecially this *Sadducy*, *Caleb Puſie*, and his *Sadducean* Fraternity in *Penſilvania*, and here in *England* and elſewhere, they argue againſt the Reſurrection of the Body it ſelf, from the manner of it, as thus; If the ſame body for ſubſtance ſhall be raiſed, then it muſt be raiſed, for manner, ſuch as it is now, but that is impoſſible. Now the Apoſtle anſwers, by denying, that it ſhall be raiſed in the ſame manner, but it ſhall quite be changed and transformed, not tranſubſtantiated, from mortal and corruptible, and Natural or Animal, to immortal, incorruptible and ſpiritual. Oh, ſay they, this connot be, this would be a Tranſubſtantiation, like that of the Papiſts. But I ſay, this *Caleb Puſie*, and his Fraternity, that profeſs to hold a Reſurrection of the body, but not of that ſame ſubſtance, fall in with the Popiſh Tranſubſtantion; for Tranſubſtantiation is a change of a thing from one ſubſtance to another, as the Papiſts ſay; and therefore *Caleb Puſie*, and his brethren, who deny that the body is the ſame in ſubſtance, but changed from one ſubſtance to another, are clearly one with the Papiſts, in their abſurd Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation: And thus the Pit he and his *Sadducean* brethren have digged for me, he and they are fallen into both together.

And it is manifeſt Hypocriſie in *Caleb Puſie* and his brethren, for him and them to ſay, they think it not neceſſary to be curiouſly prying into the manner of it, when they are moſt abſurd in determining the manner of it, contrary to all Scripture and Reaſon. For they will needs have it, that the change is a change of the ſubſtance, and not of the Quality and Condition: The Body, ſay they, that the dead are raiſed with, is another body in ſubſtance, ſo they will needs have it. But then let him tell us, when the deceaſed Saints get this other body, that is another in ſubſtance: I ſuppoſe he will ſay with his brethren, in the ſame ignorance and unbelief, *G. W.* and *W. P.* that they get it immediately after Death; for they both argue againſt the deceaſed Saints expecting any Reſurrection of the body, that this implies the Soul to be in a kind of Purgatory or Diſquietneſs, till the ſuppoſed Reſumption of the body.

Page 41. He chargeth *G. K.* to be guilty of belying the Magiſtrates at *Philadelphia*, Printing, That the Magiſtrates not only countenanced the hiring men to fight, but alſo gave them a Commiſſion ſo to do, ſigned by Three Juſtices of Peace, whereof one was a Preacher, citing Appeal from the 28, *&c.* And from thence he juſtifieth their Perſecution againſt *G. K.* in fining him Five Pounds,

Pounds. But now how he proves this to be false, first, he saith, it was more than they had power to do, being Civil Magistrates. But this is no Proof; for ignorant men, such as they were, might go beyond their power. However, he grants, if it was not a Commission, it was a Warrant of a *Hue and Cry*, signed but by Two Justices of Peace, and neither of them a Preacher. But what Proof brings he for this? None but his bare Affirmation. But so it was, that some of them who received the Commission, told us, it was a Commission signed by Three Justices, whereof one of them was a Preacher. And when this very matter was debated before the Yearly Meeting at *London*, 3d mo. 1694. *Samuel Jennings* pretending it was not a Commission, but a *Hue and Cry*, *Thomas Lower* contradicted it in my hearing, and the hearing of many others, saying, it could be no *Hue and Cry*, for no *Hue and Cry* had any power to extend beyond dry Land; but this was to go to the Water, which I leave to men better skill'd in Law to determine: However, whether a Commission, or *Hue and Cry*, which is but a Nicety of Phrase in Politicks and worldly Government, it confirms the substance of what was affirmed, That *some Quakers signed a Paper, commanding and giving power to men, by Force of Arms, to retake a Sloop*; which is sufficiently known to be against the professed principles of the Quakers here in *England*, who have witnessed by divers Printed Books and Testimonies, That they are against all use of Carnal Weapons, so much as in self-defence, and have declared against Ship-masters, that were Quakers, their carrying Arms, so much as in self-defence.

Page 41. Another falshood he chargeth on *G. K.* is, That he said, *the Ministers there*, viz. *in* Pensilvania. *had ingrossed the Worldly Government*. And this he offereth to prove to be false, for there were many that were not Ministers, nor Quakers neither, then in the Government. But this he only saith, and it is a notorious Falshood, well known to them that lived there; for on the contrary, very few, but *Quakers*, were Magistrates, and for most part Preachers, and these few that were not *Quakers*, nor Ministers, they were but as meer Cyphers, the Ministers ruled all, and did all, and the small number of the rest signified nothing, in that properly called the Province of *Pensilvania*; and Ministers were not only Justices, but Criminal Judges, a thing no where so practised, that I know, any where in Christendom beside. But however, whether *G. K.* was rightly informed in these Particulars, or not, that was not the Thing he was fined for, but for calling *Sam. Jennings*, an ignorant, presumptuous and insolent man, and saying, he was too high and imperious in worldly Courts. And this was and is well known to be a Truth; And he since remains sufficiently under that Character.

And have not many called *Quakers*, used greater liberty than all this, to reprove the Pride of greater Men in Magistracy here in *England* in Times past, under their sharp Persecutions? And for a witness to it, let the Trial of *William Penn* and *William Mead*, Printed at *London*, declare, as well as other Printed Trials and Books, not a few. But it is but waste of Time and Paper to answer to all his Impertinencies. One thing is greatly worth noticing, That though these men showed great warmth to fine, imprison, and otherwise prosecute, for some pretended Offences against them, that were (had they been real) but small, and had better become them to have passed them by, being not against them as Magistrates, but as *Quakers* and Neighbours; Yet they did not only tolerate, but support and countenance Persons guilty of blasphemous Speeches against both God and Christ, and with an unbounded Liberty, did abuse me in particular, as well as my Friends, one of them in a publick Meeting calling me, *Wicked Fellow*, another calling me *Rasier*, *wicked Man*, while I was in Prayer on my Knees, in the Meeting. And though they would not allow us to distinguish be-

twixt them, as being *Quakers* and Magiſtrates, yet they did ſo diſtinguiſh, when they told us, They were not for fighting, as *Quakers*, but as Magiſtrates, which how apt and proper a diſtinction it was for them to uſe, I leave to the intelligent to judge.

Page 46. He ſaith, *Now to be plain, This is to ſhew, That* G. K. *may be (as well as others have been) a man of great Knowledge in Chronology, yet being led by a Wrong Spirit, what doth it profit?* But how hath he proved, that *G. K.* is a man of a Wrong Spirit? What One Evil Thing hath he proved againſt me in all his book, either in Doctrine or Converſation? I know none: Though I have proved him guilty of many. And taking it for granted, That *G. K.* on extraordinary great Provocations and Abuſes, did drop, once or twice, ſome unadviſed (yet true) Expreſſions, doth this prove him to be a man of a Wrong Spirit? He hath been more ingenuous than all his Adverſaries, who have far exceeded him in heat and hard words, to acknowledge it, which I never knew that any of them did.

Page 47. He pretends he has got a great Advantage againſt me, upon the Account of a Citation out of my book, called, *Truths Defence*, page 169. which he recites, though not ſo truly, as is in my book. But however, as it is, I agree to it, as to matter and ſubſtance. And though he ſaith, Page 53. That they do not queſtion that in the leaſt, that *G. K.* is of another mind now. It is a falſe Inſinuation, I remain in the ſame mind ſtill, That I would have nothing urged, nor preſſed as Articles of Faith, but what is delivered to us in plain expreſs Scripture-words (which is the ſubſtance of that large Citation). And it is as falſe in him to ſay, That this was ſo often deſired, but could not find place, *viz.* to take their Confeſſion in expreſs words, for this we never refuſed: but I ſaid again and again, *We ſhall take your Confeſſion in Scripture-words* (as many can bear me witneſs), *provided ye will condemn your Errors that are contrary either to expreſs Scripture-words, or to the plain and manifeſt Senſe of them, obvious to every intelligent Chriſtian.* But this they would never do. And whereas he queſtieth, *How know we that they have a Senſe contrary to Scripture-words?* I anſwer, They have ſufficiently diſcovered it, not only by One or Two unſound Expreſſions, but multitudes of them, as their Letters, and Manuſcripts there, and the Printed Books here, ſufficiently prove; And we need go no further for a Proof, than the moſt groſs and Antichriſtian Expreſſions and Sayings of *Caleb Puſie* himſelf, in this very Treatiſe. For whereas he hath plainly affirmed, p. 15. *ad finem, That Jeſus of* Nazareth *cannot be ſomething elſe than the Light, Power and Spirit within.* Now can there be any thing more contrary to expreſs Scripture, than this Aſſertion? Was not Jeſus of *Nazareth* a real man, conſiſting of Soul and Body, in whom the fullneſs of the Godhead dwelt bodily, and who, *above meaſure, was filled with all fullneſs of Grace and Truth*: And is that Body, and that Soul, and that Fullneſs, nothing elſe but the Light within us? Oh, Abominable Nonſenſe, and Perverſion, and Contradiction to Scripture, and all true Reaſon! He may as much ſay, The great body of water in the Ocean, with the Channels and Places that receive it, is nothing elſe than the River *Thames*, and that little narrow Tract of Earth in which it runs. And at this Rate, whatever is declared of Chriſt, as born at *Bethlem*, or converſing with his Diſciples in *Judea, teaching them, and working mighty Signs and Miracles among them*; And laſtly, Crucified on the Tree of the Croſs at *Golgotha*, muſt be underſtood of nothing elſe but the Light, Power and Spirit within. If this be not as great and groſs Ranteriſm as ever was among men, I leave all ſober Chriſtians to Judge. Again, ſeeing he pretends ſo much to expreſs Scripture, let him tell me, 1. Where doth the Scripture ſay, That *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* is nothing elſe than the Light, Power and Spirit within? I am ſure it is no where to be found in the Holy Bible; but in

Pounds. But now how he proves this to be false, first, he saith, it was more than they had power to do, being Civil Magistrates. But this is no Proof; for ignorant men, such as they were, might go beyond their power. However, he grants, if it was not a Commission, it was a Warrant of a *Hue and Cry*, signed but by Two Justices of Peace, and neither of them a Preacher. But what Proof brings he for this? None but his bare Affirmation. But so it was, that some of them who received the Commission, told us, it was a Commission signed by Three Justices, whereof one of them was a Preacher. And when this very matter was debated before the Yearly Meeting at *London*, 3d mo. 1694. *Samuel Jennings* pretending it was not a Commission, but a *Hue and Cry*, *Thomas Lower* contradicted it in my hearing, and the hearing of many others, saying, it could be no *Hue and Cry*, for no *Hue and Cry* had any power to extend beyond dry Land; but this was to go to the Water, which I leave to men better skill'd in Law to determine: However, whether a Commission, or *Hue and Cry*, which is but a Nicety of Phrase in Politicks, and worldly Government, it confirms the substance of what was affirmed, That *some Quakers signed a Paper, commanding and giving power to men, by Force of Arms, to retake a Sloop*; which is sufficiently known to be against the professed principles of the Quakers here in *England*, who have witnessed by divers Printed Books and Testimonies, That they are against all use of Carnal Weapons, so much as in self-defence, and have declared against Ship-masters, that were Quakers, their carrying Arms, so much as in self defence.

Page 41. Another falshood he chargeth on *G. K.* is, That he said, *the Ministers there*, viz. *in* Pensilvania. *had ingrossed the Worldly Government*. And this he offereth to prove to be false, for there were many that were not Ministers, nor Quakers neither, then in the Government. But this he only saith, and it is a notorious Falshood, well known to them that lived there; for on the contrary, very few, but *Quakers*, were Magistrates, and for most part Preachers, and these few that were not *Quakers*, nor Ministers, they were but as meer Cyphers, the Ministers ruled all, and did all, and the small number of the rest signified nothing, in that properly called the Province of *Pensilvania*; and Ministers were not only Justices, but Criminal Judges, a thing no where so practised, that I know, any where in Christendom beside. But however, whether *G. K.* was rightly informed in these Particulars, or not, that was not the Thing he was fined for, but for calling *Sam. Jennings*, an ignorant, presumptuous and insolent man, and saying, he was too high and imperious in worldly Courts. And this was and is well known to be a Truth; And he since remains sufficiently under that Character.

And have not many called *Quakers*, used greater liberty than all this, to reprove the Pride of greater Men in Magistracy here in *England* in Times past, under their sharp Persecutions? And for a witness to it, let the Trial of *William Penn* and *William Mead*, Printed at *London*, declare, as well as other Printed Trials and Books, not a few. But it is but waste of Time and Paper to answer to all his Impertinencies. One thing is greatly worth noticing, That though these men showed great warmth to fine, imprison, and otherwise prosecute, for some pretended Offences against them, that were (had they been real) but small, and had better become them to have passed them by, being not against them as Magistrates, but as *Quakers* and Neighbours; Yet they did not only tolerate, but support and countenance Persons guilty of blasphemous Speeches against both God and Christ, and with an unbounded Liberty, did abuse me in particular, as well as my Friends, one of them in a publick Meeting calling me, *Wicked Fellow*, another calling me *Ranter*, *wicked Man*, while I was in Prayer on my Knees, in the Meeting. And though they would not allow us to distinguish be-

twixt them, as being *Quakers* and Magiſtrates, yet they did ſo diſtinguiſh, when they told us, They were not for fighting, as *Quakers*, but as Magiſtrates, which how apt and proper a diſtinction it was for them to uſe, I leave to the intelligent to judge.

Page 46. He ſaith, *Now to be plain, This is to ſhew, That G. K. may be (as well as others have been) a man of great Knowledge in Chronology, yet being led by a Wrong Spirit, what doth it profit?* But how hath he proved, that *G. K.* is a man of a Wrong Spirit? What One Evil Thing hath he proved againſt me in all his book, either in Doctrine or Converſation? I know none: Though I have proved him guilty of many. And taking it for granted, That *G. K.* on extraordinary great Provocations and Abuſes, did drop, once or twice, ſome unadviſed (yet true) Expreſſions, doth this prove him to be a man of a Wrong Spirit? He hath been more ingenuous than all his Adverſaries, who have far exceeded him in heat and hard words, to acknowledge it, which I never knew that any of them did.

Page 47. He pretends he has got a great Advantage againſt me, upon the Account of a Citation out of my book, called, *Truths Defence*, page 169. which he recites, though not ſo truly, as is in my book. But however, as it is, I agree to it, as to matter and ſubſtance. And though he ſaith, Page 53. That they do not queſtion that in the leaſt, that *G. K.* is of another mind now. It is a falſe Inſinuation, I remain in the ſame mind ſtill, That I would have nothing urged, nor preſſed as Articles of Faith, but what is delivered to us in plain expreſs Scripture-words (which is the ſubſtance of that large Citation). And it is as falſe in him to ſay, That this was ſo often deſired, but could not find place, *viz.* to take their Confeſſion in expreſs words, for this we never refuſed: but I ſaid again and again, *We ſhall take your Confeſſion in Scripture-words* (as many can bear me witneſs), *provided ye will condemn your Errors that are contrary either to expreſs Scripture-words, or to the plain and manifeſt Senſe of them, obvious to every intelligent Chriſtian.* But this they would never do. And whereas he querieth, *How know we that they have a Senſe contrary to Scripture-words?* I anſwer, They have ſufficiently diſcovered it, not only by One or Two unſound Expreſſions, but multitudes of them, as their Letters, and Manuſcripts there, and the Printed Books here, ſufficiently prove; And we need go no further for a Proof, than the moſt groſs and Antichriſtian Expreſſions and Sayings of *Caleb Puſie* himſelf, in this very Treatiſe. For whereas he hath plainly affirmed, p. 15. *ad finem, That Jeſus of* Nazareth *cannot be ſomething elſe than the Light, Power and Spirit within.* Now can there be any thing more contrary to expreſs Scripture, than this Aſſertion? Was not Jeſus of *Nazareth* a real man, conſiſting of Soul and Body, in whom the fullneſs of the Godhead dwelt bodily, and who, *above meaſure, was filled with all fullneſs of Grace and Truth*: And is that Body, and that Soul, and that Fullneſs, nothing elſe but the Light within us? Oh, Abominable Nonſenſe, and Perverſion, and Contradiction to Scripture, and all true Reaſon! He may as much ſay, The great body of water in the Ocean, with the Channels and Places that receive it, is nothing elſe than the River *Thames*, and that little narrow Tract of Earth in which it runs. And at this Rate, whatever is declared of Chriſt, as born at *Bethlem*, or converſing with his Diſciples in *Judea, teaching them, and working mighty Signs and Miracles among them*; And laſtly, Crucified on the Tree of the Croſs at *Golgotha*, muſt be underſtood of nothing elſe but the Light, Power and Spirit within. If this be not as great and groſs Ranteriſm as ever was among men. I leave all ſober Chriſtians to Judge. Again, ſeeing he pretends ſo much to expreſs Scripture, let him tell me, 1. Where doth the Scripture ſay, That *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* is nothing elſe than the Light, Power and Spirit within? I am ſure it is no where to be found in the Holy Bible; but in

Anſ-

Antichrift's Bible it may be found, and is found. 2. Where doth the Scripture ſay, That the Light within is ſufficient to ſalvation, without any thing elſe? or that it is an Error to ſay, The Light within is not ſufficient to ſalvation, without ſomething elſe? Which two being contradictory, if the one be falſe, the other muſt be true. 3*dly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, it is ſufficient to Eternal Salvation, only to believe and obey the Light within, without all Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt Crucified and raiſed again, ſeeing the Scripture, plain contrarywiſe makes it the Terms of Salvation, in great part, to confeſs with the *mouth, and believe with the heart, that God hath raiſed Jeſus from the Dead*, Rom. 10. 9, 10. 4*thly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, The Blood that was ſhed without the Gates of *Jeruſalem*, is not that Blood whereby we are juſtified, which was *John Humphreys* Aſſertion, a Miniſter in *Penſilvania*, which we could never get him, nor any of you all, to condemn; and no wonder; for *G. W.* in his book, *Light and Life*, hath ſaid as much. 5*thly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, The bodies of the Saints, at the Reſurrection, ſhall be other bodies in ſubſtance, from what they were here on Earth, which this *Caleb Puſie* hath affirmed 6*thly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, The Regeneration, or Converſion of the Soul, is only a purification from ſin, as the waſhing of a body beſmeared with dirt, when cleanſed, is a Purification, and not a Tranſmutation, as *Caleb Puſey* hath alſo affirmed, as above? And though I remain ſtill in the ſame mind, That no Article of Faith ſhould be urged on any but what is contained in plain expreſs words of Scripture, (or ſo agreeable to expreſs Scripture, as the common ſenſe of all mankind, that hears Scripture words, muſt acknowledge, as though it is not ſaid, in Scriptures, That *Egypt*, *Arabia*, *Paleſtine*, *Meſopotamia*, are Places without us, yet common, Senſe tells us ſo); Yet I ſee not why I ſhould be ſo confined to expreſs Scripture words in things that I require no Man to own or believe, as Articles of Faith, but leave them to their Liberty, and others take their Liberty to uſe great variety of other words; and I think I may ſay it without vanity, the manner of my Preaching and writing has been full as much Scriptural, as to Phraſe, as moſt of the Preachers and Writers among the Quakers.

As for his querying, pag. 56. where are the expreſs Scripture words that ſay, *The four hundred pieces of Silver that* Abraham *Purchaſed the Burying Place with, ſignifies four hundred Vertues.* I Anſwer, The Scripture ſaith that as much, though not expreſly, yet implicitly, as it ſaith, The Treaſures we are to lay up in Heaven. are Spiritual and Divine Vertues, which are the true Riches, and the Wells that *Abraham* Digged, and *Iſaack* ſignified the Spiritual Wells of Water within them; and *Egypt* ſignified the power of Darkneſs, and *Canaan* that flowed with Milk and Hony, ſignified the Kingdom of God, for the Old Teſtament abounds with ſuch Allegories. But if any do not believe my interpretation by way of Allegory on that place of Scripture (while they and I own the literal Senſe) or any others of the like nature, I am far from urging it upon them, but leave them to their free Judgment, and as God ſhall be pleaſed to Enlighten them. For there are many things both in my Book, called, *Truth Advanced* (ſo reproachfully mentioned by him) and in many other of my Books, wherein I may poſſibly differ from others in Judgment; yet I leave them to their Liberty to Diſſent, as I deſire to be left to my Liberty, to believe as I judg God has perſwaded me. But ſuch as differ from me, ſo far, and ſo wide, as this Perſon doth, *Caleb Puſie*, and theſe of the Second Days Meeting, that have Countenanced and Approved his moſt Antichriſtian Doctrines, directly contrary to the great fundamentals of Chriſtianity, affirming Jeſus of *Nazareth* to be nothing elſe but the Light within; and ſaying,

The

The Light within is ſufficient to Salvation, without any thing elſe; ſo Excluding our Lord Jeſus of *Nazareth*, his Death, and Sufferings, his Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, Mediation for us in Heaven; all which are ſomething elſe than the Light within, from being concerned in our Salvation, I can by no means own them to be my Chriſtian Brethren, but eſteem them to be worſe than *Mahometans*, and than other Sober and Honeſt Heathens or Gentiles, for their oppoſing ſo great Truths ſo plainly expreſt in Holy Scripture; and it is not the Light *in* them, but groſs Darkneſs that leads them into theſe abominable Errors, and the very Spirit of Antichriſt Poſſeſſes them, and they are ſuch Antichriſts, concerning whom *John* Teſtified, 1 *John* 2. 18. and 1 *John* 9. 3. *Every Spirit that Confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is not of God.* And this is that Spirit of Antichriſt, &c. For notwithſtanding their ſeeming confeſſions to him, yet ſeeing they own not Juſtification by his Blood outwardly ſhed, and Salvation by Faith in him, as he Dyed for us, and Roſe again, their Faith and Confeſſion is vain, and Hypocritical.

G. K.

London, the 2d. of the 4th *Month*, 1696.

Some

Antichriſt's Bible it may be found, and is found. 2. Where doth the Scripture ſay, That the Light within is ſufficient to ſalvation, without any thing elſe? or that it is an Error to ſay, The Light within is not ſufficient to ſalvation, without ſomething elſe? Which Two being contradictory, if the one be falſe, the other muſt be true. 3*dly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, it is ſufficient to Eternal Salvation, only to believe and obey the Light within, without all Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt Crucified and raiſed again, ſeeing the Scripture, plain contrarywiſe makes it the Terms of Salvation, in great part, to confeſs with the *mouth, and believe with the heart, that God hath raiſed Jeſus from the Dead*, Rom. 10. 9, 10. 4*thly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, The Blood that was ſhed without the Gates of *Jeruſalem*, is not that Blood whereby we are juſtified, which was *John Humphreys* Aſſertion, a Miniſter in *Penſilvania*, which we could never get him, nor any of you all, to condemn; and no wonder; for *G. W.* in his book, *Light and Life*, hath ſaid as much. 5*thly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, The bodies of the Saints, at the Reſurrection, ſhall be other bodies in ſubſtance, from what they were here on Earth, which this *Caleb Puſie* hath affirmed 6*thly*, Where doth the Scripture ſay, The Regeneration, or Converſion of the Soul, is only a purification from ſin, as the waſhing of a body beſmeared with dirt, when cleanſed, is a Purification, and not a Tranſmutation, as *Caleb Puſey* hath alſo affirmed, as above? And though I remain ſtill in the ſame mind, That no Article of Faith ſhould be urged on any but what is contained in plain, expreſs words of Scripture, (or ſo agreeable to expreſs Scripture, as the common ſenſe of all mankind, that hears Scripture words, muſt acknowledge, as though it is not ſaid, in Scriptures, That *Egypt*, *Arabia*, *Paleſtine*, *Meſopotamia*, are Places without us, yet common, Senſe tells us ſo); Yet I ſee not why I ſhould be ſo confined to expreſs Scripture words in things that I require no Man to own or believe, as Articles of Faith, but leave them to their Liberty, and others take their Liberty to uſe great variety of other words; and I think I may ſay it without vanity, the manner of my Preaching and writing has been full as much Scriptural, as to Phraſe, as moſt of the Preachers and Writers among the Quakers.

As for his querying, pag. 56. where are the expreſs Scripture words that ſay, *The four hundred pieces of Silver that* Abraham *Purchaſed the Burying Place with, ſignifies four hundred Vertues.* I Anſwer, The Scripture ſaith that as much, though not expreſly, yet implicitly, as it ſaith, The Treaſures we are to lay up in Heaven, are Spiritual and Divine Vertues, which are the true Riches, and the Wells that *Abraham* Digged, and *Iſaack*, ſignified the Spiritual Wells of Water within them; and *Egypt* ſignified the power of Darkneſs, and *Canaan* that flowed with Milk and Hony, ſignified the Kingdom of God, for the Old Teſtament abounds with ſuch Allegories. But if any do not believe my interpretation by way of Allegory on that place of Scripture (while they and I own the literal Senſe) or any others of the like nature, I am far from urging it upon them, but leave them to their free Judgment, and as God ſhall be pleaſed to Enlighten them. For there are many things both in my Book, called, *Truth Advanced* (ſo reproachfully mentioned by him) and in many other of my Books, wherein I may poſſibly differ from others in Judgment; yet I leave them to their Liberty to Diſſent, as I deſire to be left to my Liberty, to believe as I judg God has perſwaded me. But ſuch as differ from me, ſo far, and ſo wide, as this Perſon doth, *Caleb Puſie*, and theſe of the Second Days Meeting, that have Countenanced and Approved his moſt Antichriſtian Doctrines, directly contrary to the great fundamentals of Chriſtianity, affirming Jeſus of *Nazareth* to be nothing elſe but the Light within; and ſaying,

The

The Light within is ſufficient to Salvation, without any thing elſe; ſo Excluding our Lord Jeſus of *Nazareth*, his Death, and Sufferings, his Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, Mediation for us in Heaven; all which are ſomething elſe than the Light within, from being concerned in our Salvation, I can by no means own them to be my Chriſtian Brethren, but eſteem them to be worſe than *Mahometans*, and than other Sober and Honeſt Heathens or Gentiles, for their oppoſing ſo great Truths ſo plainly expreſt in Holy Scripture; and it is not the Light in them, but groſs Darkneſs that leads them into theſe abominable Errors, and the very Spirit of Antichriſt Poſſeſſes them, and they are ſuch Antichriſts, concerning whom *John* Teſtified, 1 *John* 2. 18. and 1 *John* 9. 3. *Every Spirit that Confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is not of God.* And this is that Spirit of Antichriſt, &c. For notwithſtanding their ſeeming confeſſions to him, yet ſeeing they own not Juſtification by his Blood outwardly ſhed, and Salvation by Faith in him, as he Dyed for us, and Roſe again, their Faith and Confeſſion is vain, and Hypocritical.

G. K.

London, the 2d. of the 4th *Month*, 1696.

Some

Some REMARKS *on* John Pennington's *late Book, entituled,* The People called Quakers cleared, *&c. and* G. Whitehead *his Poſtſcript. Shewing ſome of their groſs Perverſions, Falſhoods, and Groundleſs Calumnies againſt* G. K.

Pag. 3. THeir blaming me for appointing a Meeting, to which their Conſent was neither ſought, nor made Neceſſary.

Anſw. They got timely Notice a Month before-hand, and were deſired to be preſent and why might not I appoint a Meeting without their Conſent, to Detect their Errors, and to ſhow the Unjuſtneſs of their Sentence of Excommunication againſt me, as without my Conſent, they appointed a Meeting to Excommunicate me; I deſired them again and again in former Prints to conſent to Time and Place; yea, to appoint Time and Place, and I ſhould ſtand to their Appointment; But they ſtill refuſed, *Offenders uſe not to conſent to their Tryal.*

P. 3. Their charging me with Spleen and Malice. I reject as falſe and fictitious.

P. 4. Their telling of two Books lying on my Hand unanſwered, and my having given them Ground to expect an Anſwer to two of them.

Anſw. To the firſt, ſome of their own Church have ſufficiently anſwered, to ſhow the Badneſs of their Cauſe, in that Cenſure they gave againſt *Thomas Elwood*, which was read at the Meeting at *Turner's-Hall*, 11th. of the 4th. Month. 1696. and is Printed in the *Exact Narrative*, pag. 46. To the ſecond, and all the other I anſwered at that Meeting, and have ſufficiently detected their Abuſes, Fallacies, Perverſions, as well as Falſe Doctrines; though I have a great deal more in reſerve. But all impartial Men will clear me of any blame, in not anſwering them in Print, when I have offered to Anſwer them *viva voce*, at a Meeting; for there is no end of anſwering them in Print; and they can, and do more ſecurely Forge, Pervert, and Abuſe their Readers and me alſo, in Print, becauſe they know few will be at the pains to compare their Books with mine, to ſee who is innocent or blame-worthy: But Face to Face, and by Word of Mouth, it is eaſily made apparent; and beſide, as I have formerly told, to print Books to anſwer all their Books, is too great a Charge for me.

P. 4. They alledge, 'I have vindicated their Principles from their Common Adverſaries.

Anſw. Such as I did think were their Principles, I did formerly vindicate; but moſt of them, which I did think were their Principles, I have found of late were not their Principles, though I retain them ſtill as mine; and I challenge them, or any Man, to prove, that ever I did vindicate any of theſe four abominable Principles, which I have proved *G. W.* and *W. P.* guilty of at the late Meeting, 11th. 4th Month, 1696. and whereof the late Printed *Narrative* gives an Account And though they alledge, I have changed my Principles, yet they have not made it to appear, nor I believe they ever ſhall, that in any one Article of the *Chriſtian Faith* that are reckoned among the *Simpliciter credenda*, I have changed any one Principle. Only as to the Senſe of ſome Places of Scripture, relating to *Water-Baptiſm*, and the *Supper*, I own I have changed my Mind, but to the better; and alſo as to ſome other places of Scripture, improperly alledged to prove ſome real Truths.

P. 4. to p. 10. As concerning theſe ſeveral Teſtimonies they bring out of my Books in all theſe pages, I own every one of them ſtill, as things ſincerely believed by me,

and I believe by many others also, so far as they relate to Doctrine. But that I held them forth as the Principles of the Teachers among the Quakers universally, or as the Principles of *G. W.* and *W. Penn*, seeing I have since found them so palpably to contradict them in their Printed Books, *I* freely acknowledge my shortness and mistake therein. But they most uncharitably alledge, That it is hardness in me, to have changed my Opinion, or Persuasion of these men, seeing they have given me so great and just occasion so to do, by boldly defending and excusing these vile Errors.

The next thing they charge me with, is my Inconsistency and Self-contradiction; but this is a False Charge, their manifest failure in their undertaking will sufficiently, I hope prove. The first Self-contradiction they think they have catched me in, is what they bring in *pag.* 111,2. viz. That I said, (*Nameless Bull*, pag. 11.) 'Seeing this 'true Faith is wrought in God's ordinary way by Preaching, therefore the true 'Faith of Christ's Death and Sufferings ought to be one of the first and chiefest things 'that every true Minister ought to Preach, *&c.* But they think I contradict this, [*Way to the City of God*, pag. 3.] 'The knowledge of his inward coming, is 'that which is the more needful, and in the first place, as being that by which the 'true and comfortable use of his outward coming is alone sufficiently understood.

Answ. As I have somewhere else said, It is my Lot to have to do with Men, that have neither so much true Logick, nor Common Sense, as to understand what a true Contradiction is. Let any Man of common sense judge, if it be a contradiction, or least inconsistency to say, *The true Faith of Christs Death is one of the first things that ought to be Preached, to bring Men to witness the true Faith of Christs Death, and being made Conformable to his Death*: And also to say, *The knowledge of his inward coming is the more needful in the first place*: As it is no contradiction to say *George Whitehead* was one of the first Quakers in the North of *England*; *George Fox* was the first Quaker. But for the better understanding of the Case, the distinction betwixt *general Religion* and *Christian Religion*, is to be considered, (which distinction I have used in my Book, called *Divine immediate Revelation and Inspiration continued in the true Church*, Printed at *London*, 1684. and which was read and approved by the Second Days Meeting, when I was present, and therefore G. W. is bound to own what is in that Book, unless he will say, their Ministers are changed in their Principles) see *pag.* 44. where I also distinguish betwixt *general Revelation* in Men, and *special*; the *general* I said was common to all Mankind, the *special* given to true Christians. By *general Revelation*, (which is that common illumination given to all Mankind, men are taught to know that God is, and that he is the maker of all things, and that he hath given a Law to Men, in their Hearts, which they are to obey; and when they disobey this Law, they make themselves guilty before God; and by this *general Revelation*, or illumination, Men generally know that they are Sinners, all having sinned; and by this inward Law, and illumination, common to all men, is the knowledge of Sin, and of the Wrath of God, that is due for Sin: and by this General or Common illumination, many of the *Gentiles* came so far as the Servants state, and had acceptance with God as Servants, but were short of the state of Sons, because they had not the Faith in Christ Crucified, according to *Gal.* 3. 26. This same distinction of *general* and *special* Revelation, in other terms I held forth in my Book of *Universal Grace*, approved also by the Second Days Meeting. and Printed in the Year 1671. which is about 25 Years ago; see pag. 8, 9, 10. of that Book, where I largely treat of a twofold inward Appearance of Christ in Men, the first and second, and how the first prepareth for the second; and how the first is not to be rested in, but that we ought to press forward into the second, *pag.* 9. *ad finitum*. And I said, the first was that of the Law, the second that of the Gospel, *pag.* 8 The former that of the first Covenant, the latter that of the second Covenant. And I say expresly, *pag.* 8. 'The Gospel lay hid within the Law, as within a Vail, which

ad finem.

which the outward Tabernacle did plainly figure and hold forth: And notwithstanding that I have held forth this distinction in Print 25 Years ago, yet many of my present Adversaries cry out against it as New Doctrine, and contrary to Friends Principles. And it most evidently appeareth from the expres Words of my Book of *Universal Grace*, pag. 120. That I did not then hold that the Light within was sufficient to Salvation without any thing else, or without Christ's outward coming, and his Obedience, Sufferings and Death, (as my Adversaries *Caleb Pusie*, and the Second Days Meeting that hath approved his Book do affirm, and as these Men also do, who have given out their Scandalous Book, called *The People called Quakers cleared*) for I say expressly in that *pag.* 120. 'The Light within, and Christ's outward coming 'with his Obedience, Sufferings and Death, are both sufficient, useful and necessary 'in their own kind and way, Consummating, and being Consummate in another. And here Note, that though I did not say, Christ within, and Christ without, are two Christs; yet I said his Light within, and his Coming in the Outward, with his Obedience, Sufferings and Death, were two things, Consummating and being Consummated in one another. Now to wipe off the Injurious Charge of my Adversaries G. W. and J. P. in this particular (which I thank God, I can as easily do, and all other their Injurious Charges against me, as *Paul* did throw off the Viper from his Hand, I say conform to the Doctrine of my former Books, and in good Consistency with all the passages in them, the Light within (which in a true sense is God and Christ the Eternal and Essential Word) is to be Preached in the first place, to *Heathens* and *Gentiles*, or any other called *Christians*, who have not any true knowledge of God, or fear and reverence of him, and to all bold and presumptuous Sinners, and briefly to all Men whatsoever, not really and truly converted to the Christian Religion, to bring them in the first place to some knowledge of God, and some true fear and reverence of him, and also to some true knowledge and sense of their sinful state and condition, and that they are liable to the Wrath and Displeasure of God for their Sins; all which are in good order previous or prior to the true Christian Faith, which is a Faith in Christ crucified and therefore may be Preached before that Faith. But that the Christian Faith it self may be received by Preaching, that Faith is one of the first things that is to be preached, as being one of the first Principles of the Christian Religion, as is clear from these Scriptures, *Acts* 20, 21. where *Repentance towards God*, and *Faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ*, are joined together as first Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, compared with *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. And these Ignorant Men so deeply Prejudiced against the Preaching of Christ Crucified (to wit, G. W. and J. P.) as being one of the first things needful to be Preached, and Faith in him, in Order to make Men true Christians, might by the same Silly Sophistry and Quibling, accuse *Paul* and *John* contradicting each other and inconsistent; yea, the Holy Ghost himself, who did inspire them both, in what they wrot: For whenas *Paul* told the *Corinthians*, when he Preached the Gospel unto them, 1 *Cor.* 15. 3. that he *delivered* unto them *First of All* (Note these Words, *first of all*) that which he also *received*, *how that Christ dyed for our Sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day*, &c. And yet *John* Preached not that the first thing, but began with Preaching the *Word that was in the beginning*, and how in that *Word was Life*, and *the Life was the Light of Men*; *and that Light was the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world*, John 1. 1. to 9. But in this there is no Contradiction nor Inconsistency betwixt *Paul* and *John*; for *John* begins with that Principle of Doctrine that is necessary to General Religion, and to the Knowledge of God as Creator; *Paul* begins with the Preaching CHRIST Crucified, as one of the first things necessary to Christian Religion, and the knowledge thereof: And such Order is necessary in teaching Practical Arts and Sciences, as in order to teach

Astronomy, some first Principles of *Arithmetick* and *Geometry* are necessary to be taught in the first place, as to add and substract in Arithmetick, &c. And to make a Perpendicular Line, or draw a Paralel, to bisect an Angle, &c. Yet none of these are properly Principles of *Astronomy*, as it is a peculiar Science: But the first Principles of *Astronomy* are not to be taught before *Arithmetick* and *Geometry*, but after them. And so the first Principles of Medicine, are to be taught after the first Principles of the Physicks; and thus the first Principles of Christian Theology are to be taught after the first Principles of Ethicks, or Ethology, which was the *Gentile* Religion, and which did teach many true and excellent things of God, as is to be seen in *Aristotle*'s Ethicks, who wrote of θειον τι i. e. something Divine in Man, by which he could live virtuously; and yet who but he that is no true Christian himself will say, that *Aristotle*'s Ethicks, or *Socrate*'s and *Platoe*'s Morals, are enough to teach the Christian Theology. Thus I hope I have made it appear, that as my Adversaries have not proved me inconsistent with my self, so they have proved themselves inconsistent with true Christianity, and no true Christians in their Principles, but Heathens, and falling short of Heathen Morals, in Falsly accusing the Innocent, a Vice contrary to true Morality.

The second part of their Charge, in *pag.* 10. is, 'That I did formerly hold that 'Christ's Inward coming saves, where the Outward is unknown. But here they are guilty of gross Forgery and Perversion; first of Forgery, seeing they cite no passage in any of my Books, where I express these Words, *where the Outward is unknown*, and seeing by their Words, *where the Outward is unknown*, they mean Christ's coming without us, I say they are guilty of grosly perverting my Words and Sense, as if I did hold, that Christ's inward coming saves, with Eternal Salvation, without all knowledge of Christ's outward coming; and in contradiction to themselves, they grant I have distinguished betwixt the *express* or *explicit* Knowledge and Faith of Christ's Death and Sufferings, in order to Eternal Salvation, and the *implicit* Knowledge and Faith of it; asserting this last, but not the first, as *universally* and *indispensibly necessary*. They object against this distinction idlely and falsly, that it is said by me, pag. 14. 'That the distinction betwixt *explicit* and *implicit*, is a late distinction: But the place of my Book, cited by them, saith no such thing. But I mention how in divers of my late Books I have distinguished betwixt the *express* and *implicit* Knowledge and Faith; but this proves it not to be a late distinction, for it is an antient distinction, and sufficiently implied and understood in my oldest Books, when I treat on that subject; for whereas they confess that I have used the Word *express* in my oldest Books, that proveth that I did then make that distinction, though I did not express the other term of *implicit*, which though not expressed, yet was really understood by me, as in many cases it is enough to express the one Term or Member of a distinction, as when we call a *Man* a *rational Creature* though we express not the Word *Irrational*, yet we sufficiently distinguish betwixt a Man and a Bruit, that Man is *rational*, and a Bruit is *irrational*; and when I say, some or many things commanded us, are *jure divino*, this sufficiently implyeth and intimateth, to any of common sense, that some things may be commanded us, that are not *jure divino*, but *jure humano*; yea, all things done and practised by the People called Quakers, are not *jure divino*, as themselves confess; therefore as *jure divino* implieth the other term of the distinction, when not expressed, viz. *jure humano*, so the term *express* implieth the other term *implicit*, though not expressed. And though my ignorant Adversaries would make their ignorant Followers think, this is only a new and odd distinction of mine, yet all true and Orthodox *Christians* do hold it as well as I, and have used it, as they do at present, and hath its Foundation in Scripture; for when *Paul* said, *Ephes.* 3. 6. That the Mystery, how that the *Gentiles* should be fellow Heirs, and of the same Body, and partakers of his Promise in Christ by the Gospel

ſpel in other Ages was not made known unto the Sons of Men, as it is now revealed unto his Holy Apoſtles and Prophets by the Spirit, he plainly implieth this diſtinction, for in other Ages, yea, in all Ages it was at leaſt *obſcurely* and *implicitly* made known but not *expreſly* as in *Paul*'s Age, and the Ages ſucceeding; and that Great Myſtery of Chriſt is ſaid by *Paul*, to have been *kept ſecret ſince the world began, but now is made manifeſt, and by the Scriptures of the Prophets, according to the commandment of the everlaſting God, made known to all Nations for the obedience of faith*, Rom. 16. 25, 26. Now what is *made manifeſt*, but *expreſs*? And what is *kept ſecret*, but *implicit*? So that this very diſtinction, which my ignorant Adverſaries blame in me as new and odd, is the very diſtinction of *Paul* in equivalent terms: And ſeeing they will not allow that diſtinction, as applied to the Knowledge of Chriſt without us, of *expreſs* and *implicit*, it is plain they hold, that not any Knowledge, not the leaſt grain of the knowledge of Chriſt without men, is univerſally neceſſary to Salvation, neither *expreſs* nor *implicit*; which how Antichriſtian and Unſcriptural it is, I leave to all true Chriſtians to judge. But why will they not allow it as well, with reſpect to the knowledge of Chriſt without us, as of Chriſt within us? Will they ſay that Men may be ſaved without all knowledge of Chriſt within, either *expreſs* or *implicit*? If yea, then we ſhall ſee what ignorant Perſons they allow ſhall be ſaved, and what a prodigious Ignorance they eſtabliſh: If nay, then they muſt anſwer me with the ſame diſtinction in the ſame terms, or in terms equivalent; and if they uſe that, or any other the like diſtinction, it ſhall be found new enough to them, at leaſt as new, or rather much more new, as that I have uſed in this caſe: nor needs *G. Whitehead* blame me for uſing new Diſtinctions, ſeeing both himſelf and *William Penn* have uſed them in ſeveral Caſes, *to ſerve a turn* (a phraſe they apply to me, pag. 19.) as in excuſing *Geo. Fox* his ſaying, 'Chriſt is not diſtinct from the Saints, the Soul is a part 'of God. And when they excuſe *Js. Pennington*'s ſaying, 'Can outward Blood 'cleanſe? And *George Whitehead* his excuſing his former Sayings in divers of his old Books, 'that Chriſt is not in all Men. He comes off with this diſtinction of late, ſaying, 'He is not in all Men unitedly, or by union. Which diſtinction I uſed not only in my Book of *Univerſal Grace*, which was written in the Year 1669. (though not printed till the Year 1671.) but alſo in my Anſwer to the Thirty Queries, ſent by the Biſhop of *Aberden*, expreſly mentioned in the Preface to *Robert Barclay*'s Anſwer to *William Mitchel*, in his Preface to it, called, *Truth cleared of Calumnies*. The which Anſwer of mine to the ſaid Thirty Queries, was given in the Year 1666. before R. B. printed any thing, or before he was a Quaker: And I the rather mention this my Anſwer to theſe Thirty Queries, becauſe in theſe chief things which my Adverſaries charge me to be changed in, my Faith is the ſame now, as it is there declared, as well as in my other Printed Books, which Anſwer I have in Manuſcript writ 30 Years ago, Copies of which are in ſeveral Hands, and which I ſhall be ready to ſhow to any ſober Enquirers. And what pittiful, unſound, and odd, as well as new Diſtinctions, hath *G. Whitehead* uſed, to excuſe *G. Fox* his ſaying, *Your Goſpel*, Matthew, Mark, Luke, *and* John, *are Duſt and the Serpents Meat*: He ſaying, *It was to be meant of the Ink and Paper which would turn to Duſt*. But who did ever call the Ink and Paper the Goſpel? or who did ever think that the Serpent, which is the Devil, doth eat Ink and Paper? Oh for ſhame! let theſe Men ceaſe to blame me for new Diſtinctions, when they have made ſo many Falſe and Nonſenſical new Diſtinctions, more Fooliſh than ever were heard of. And his excuſing *Solomon Eccles*'s Blaſphemy, in ſaying, *The Blood that came out of Chriſt's Side, was no more than the Blood of another Saint*: Behold his moſt Unlearned and Fooliſh Diſtinction, inconſiſtent with and contradictory to that known great Principle of the People called Quakers, That Chriſt dyed for all Men, and ſhed his Blood for all: *His meaning was*, ſaid G. Whitehead,

as to Papists and you, viz. Baptists, whose Minds are Carnal. But another idle impertinent Cavil they make against the distinction of *express* Knowledge of Christ's Death &c. and *implicit*, is, 'That I use that Word *express* as a word of Course, and of no 'Force, as when I said, That many of *Adam*'s Posterity suffer disadvantage by his 'Disobedience, who never knew it expressly. But that ever any perished by *Adam*'s Sin, who never knew it either *expressly*, or *implicitly*, as they alledge, seeing they bring no proof of it, I reject as false and fictitious: It is evident from the Heathen Philosophers Writings, and particularly from *Plato*, that they knew at least *implicitly* the Fall of Man, and the degeneration of Mankind in general, for *Plato* not only mentions the Fall of Man but Τὸ κακὸν Ἔμφυτον, i.e. an imbred Evil in Men, that is born with them. And how can any Impartial Reader that reads my Books, when I so oft caution, restrict and limit the Words on that subject, with the term *Express*; and at other times, with the Words *clear Distinct Knowledge*; and at other times, with the Words *Historical, Outward Knowledge*; all which, and the like Words, *R. Barclay* hath used in several Places of his *Apology*, after my Method, and divers Years after I used that Method of Expression; and I well know we were of One Mind in that thing, and I published his *Latin Theses* in *Holland* first of all, and carried them over with me out of *Scotland*, at his desire; whereof I can bring sufficient Witness; and we used to Discourse together frequently on that Subject, and both of us on purpose used these Cautions and Restricted Words, as *express*, *clear*, *distinct*, *historical*, *outward*, and *in the outward* (viz. in the outward History, or Letter) to signifie, that we did not intend that any were saved with Eternal Salvation without all Knowledge or Faith of Christ without, though without the *express* they might, and still may, where it is not revealed. And they are as Nonsensical and Ignorant, in seeking to marr my Distinction (by falsly alledging, I have marred it) by their dictator-like, saying, *There is no Medium between knowing very darkly in Vails, and Figures* (implicitly in a very obscure Degree) *and not knowing at all*, pag. 15. But to confute their Ignorance, let any Man of common Sense answer me; Is there no Medium between knowing very Darkly, and not knowing at all? Is the Particle or litle Word [*very*] Superlative in the highest Degree? or is it not rather Comparative? Is there no medium betwixt a Mans being *very ignorant*, and *knowing nothing at all*? If there be none, then by *George Whitehead*'s Logick, (who hath either writ this Book that I answer, or approved it) because he is *very Ignorant*, (as I have sufficiently proved) he *knoweth nothing at all*. But surely the most ignorant may and do know some things; therefore G. W. is as ignorant in true Logick, as in true Divinity.

Another Forgery and Perversion they put upon my Words, in pag. 15. when they make me say, 'Men have been saved without the express Knowledge of the one, *viz.* 'Christ's outward coming, but not of the other, *viz.* his inward coming. But I never said or thought any such thing, I have judged charitably, and so I still judge that many have been saved, and may be saved without the express Knowledge, as truly of his *inward* coming as of his *outward*; for many have felt and enjoyed the blessed Vertue and Power of Christ within them, and so have had an implicit knowledge of it, and it hath been saving to them, though they had not that clear and express knowledge to call it by all, or many of these Names that the Scriptures call it by expressly; and shall we say they must all perish, who though they own the Grace and Spirit of Christ, and its operation in them, yet are shy and fearful to call it Christ in them; and to be sure, as few of the *Gentiles* knew this inward Principle of Truth in them, by the express Knowledge and Names of *Jesus* and *Christ*, as knew him to be Man in the outward by these Names. And here Note, that ten several times at least in the Words and Passages they have quoted out of my Books, they bring me in, using the Word *Express* still, saying, 'The Express

'Knowledge

' Knowledge and Faith of Christ's Death is not universally necessary to Mens Sal-
' vation. And seeing in all my late Books, and also at present, I say the same. I appeal to all moderate Persons of common sense, if this be any contradiction, or rather doth not this false and unfair way of their Arguing, evidently prove them wonderfully ignorant and blinded with Prejudice against me: and let any School-Boy, or Tiro, or Person of Common Sense judge, if these two Propositions held by me, and thousands more are contradictory, The expres Knowledge and Faith of Christ is not necessary to all that shall be saved. Some Knowledge and Faith of Christ is necessary to all that shall be saved: Even as whether these two Propositions be contradictory, The clear Light of Sun, Moon, Fire or Candle, is not necessary to see and read with? Some light of Sun, Moon, Fire, or Candle is necessary to see and read with.

Their next Head is, *pag.* 23. ' That I said in my former Books, the Inward Prin-
' ciple is to be Preached in the first place, and the Effects thereof.

Answ. This I grant still, and how and in what sense, in the Words aforegoing I have sufficiently declared, and I further add, That some true knowledge of God springing from the Inward Principle, in concurrence with the serious Consideration of the Works of Creation and Providence is necessary as previous and prior to the knowledge of Christ's Death and Sufferings for our Sins; for in God's ordinary way, we are first taught that there is a God, before we are taught that there is one only Son of God, that proceeded from him by an Eternal Generation, and who became the Son of Man by Generation in the Fullness of Time. The first of these Lessons or Doctrines belong to all Men to know; and they are rather Bruits than Men who know it not. The second of these Lessons is proper and peculiar to Christians, and may well be called at least one of the first things needful to be preached, known and believed among them called *Christians*; and as the Doctrine of Christ's outward coming is truly and duly Preached by enlightned and well qualified Preachers, that more excellent and peculiar Influence and Ministration of the Spirit, that accompanies the Faith of Christ crucified, is also preached; and not only preached, but freely given and imparted by God, through Christ, to all such who hear it and believe it sincerely as it is preached. Therefore what is necessary in the first place to be preached to them that have little or no true Knowledge of God, or of an Inward Principle, is one thing, and what is first to be preached in order to bring Men to the Christian Faith and Religion more immedately and proximately, is another: as what is necessary in the first place to be Preached, to Men, that they may know God, and believe in him, as a Creator, King, and Lord over all, is one thing; and what is necessary to be preached to Men in the first place, that they may know God, and believe in him as a Gracious Father, pardoning their Sins freely for Christ's sake, and accepting them in him and that also they may believe in Christ crucified, is another thing: All which proveth sufficiently what I have delivered both in my former and latter Books, to be well consistent on this very Head, *viz.* That the Faith of Christ's Death and Sufferings is one of the first Principles of the *Christian Religion*, and therefore is so to be preached, together with the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Judgment, and Repentance from dead Works, according to *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. which according to the *Greek*, is there called *The Word of the Beginning of Christ*. But what do my Adversaries bring against me on this Head, to prove my Self-contradiction? Nothing at all; therefore they show themselves stronger in Falsly Accusing, than in justly Proving.

Their following Head is *pag.* 25. Where they charge me with a Self-contradiction in saying, ' The Gentiles were savingly enlightned, who knew not the History of
' Christ's outward coming, *&c.* And they think I contradict my self, when I said in my Book, called *A further Discovery*, pag. 10. of one called a Friend, that lately Preached, ' That he was a bold ignorant Soul, for preaching, that the Blood which

' cleanseth

' cleanseth from all Sin, was the Life, and the Life is the Light, calling it a perverse ' Exposition.

I Answer; That it is a perverse Exposition, and that he who gave it, was a bold ignorant Soul, I still affirm, and I charge them to be guilty of gross Forgery, until they prove that I have said the same, and gave that Exposition on that place of Scripture, 1 *John* 1. 7. which I do not in the least remember; but no proof they bring any where that I have so said; and their Argument is Fallacious and Deceitful like themselves, that because I have said, It is the Life that saveth, *Rom.* 5. 10. citing pag. 115. of my Book called *Universal Grace*, therefore that by *Blood* in that place 1 *John* 1. 7. I did mean the *Life*, which is the *Light within*: And the Fallacy and Sophistry of their Argument lieth in this, that because I have granted the *Life within* saveth, or cleanseth from Sin, that therefore the Blood mentioned, 1 *John* 1. 7. is the Life. Now if I had said, Nothing but the Life within saveth, or cleanseth from all Sin, they might have justly so argued: But seeing *I* ever held as I do at present hold, that there are several concurring Causes in the great Work of our Salvation, and cleansing from Sin, which though agreeing in one Harmony, yet the one Cause is not the other, therefore their Argument is as vain and false, as who did argue, the little Mustard-Seed causeth the Herb Mustard to grow, and the Earth in which it is sown causeth it to grow, and the Sun and Rain cause it to grow, therefore that little Seed is the Earth, is the Sun, and is the Rain. Our Salvation and cleansing from Sin, dependeth on divers Causes; *1st.* chiefly on God, who gave his Son to Dye for us; *2dly.* on Christ, who shed his Blood outwardly to cleanse us from Sin; *3dly.* on the Spirit, Life and Grace of Christ inwardly given us, helping and enabling us by a Living Faith, to apply the Merit, Virtue, and Efficacy of that Blood of Christ outwardly shed, for our Salvation, and cleansing both from the guilt of Sin, and the inward filth and stain of it. But before I finish my Answer to this Head, let me give Notice to the Reader of several gross Perversions, Falsities, and Abuses they put on my Sound Words, cited in their several pages, on these last Heads, from pag. 15. to pag. 33. *First*, in pag. 16. they pervert my Plain Words, where I said, ' Though Prophets and Apostles ' preached him as in the Form of a Man; yet they preached him also, and that more ' generally, as a Light to the *Gentiles*, yea, and to *Jews* also: Where they put a false and perverse sense upon the Word *more generally*, as if I did signifie by it *more frequently*, which I did not; but by *more generally*, I did and do understand, that his Inward Appearance by his Light and Grace in Men, is, and ever was *more general* than his Outward Appearance, in the outward and visible form of a Man; therefore what was in it self more general they Preached it to be so; but this doth not infer that they Preached him more frequently within Men, than without them, for if they preached, as they wrote, in their Writings, where once we read of Christ within, we read some Scores of times, of Christ, as he was outwardly manifest, was Born, Dyed, Buried, Rose again, Ascended, and is gone into Heaven, where he remains our Advocate, and Mediator with the Father. *Secondly*, They perversely infer from my Words, ' that whereas I formerly made the Knowledge and Faith of the History of ' Christ's outward coming not essential to Religion, now I did make it essential. But in this they are guilty of palpable Forgery; for as none of the citations they bring, prove it, so I do not remember that ever I so said or writ; but the Knowledge and Faith of the History is one thing; and the implicit Knowledge and Faith of Christ, as he is without us, is another thing; and therefore for them thus to confound things so differing, argueth great Ignorance, or Prejudice; and however it argueth great Falsity and Unfair Dealing. *Thirdly*, That they make it an Inconsistency and Contradiction in me to have formerly said, *Cornelius* was a Devout and Religious Man, one whose Prayer God heard; and yet of late to have said, *Cornelius* had not the Holy Ghost in his *Gentile* estate, although he had a great measure of *Gentile* Sincerity and Righteousness,

Righteouſneſs. But this is no real Contradiction, although it may ſeem ſo to their Ignorance and Darkneſs; it is eaſie to ſhow out of Scripture, that none had the Holy Ghoſt, or are ſaid to have the Holy Ghoſt, but Believers in Chriſt Crucified, who did witneſs that ſpecial Office of the Holy Ghoſt to ſanctifie them, by giving them the Holy Faith in Chriſt crucified. And though the Holy Ghoſt is holy, as well in his Nature, as in his ſpecial Office of ſanctifying them, who witneſs his indwelling in them, and union with him, yet he is commonly called ſo in Scripture, by virtue of his ſpecial Office and influence in the Hearts of Believers; and therefore as he is not ſaid to be the Holy Ghoſt or Holy Spirit in wicked men, ſo nor in pious *Gentiles*, or in ſuch only, as are but as Servants, and under the firſt Miniſtration of the Spirit, and *G. Whitehead*'s diſtinction, how Chriſt is not in all men, will ſerve in this caſe as well for me, as for him, to wit, by Union, which I think was mine in Print, before it was in Print his, according to which as Chriſt is only ſaid to live and dwell in true Believers in Chriſt, even CHRIST Crucified, and none but ſuch have Chriſt by a real Intereſt in him, and right to him, as a Woman hath to her true Huſband; So none but true Believers have the Holy Ghoſt, or the Spirit of Chriſt, to wit, by Union, Right and Intereſt, for that is only the Portion of Children, not of Servants, as it was ſaid of *Abraham*, he gave Gifts to the Children of *Ketturah*, but he gave *All*, to wit, the *Inheritance* to *Iſaac*: ſo God giveth Gifts to ſuch as are but only Servants in his Houſe, but giveth himſelf, and his dear Son, and Holy Spirit, to be the Inheritance of his Children.

And as to their Queſtion, which they think in their Ignorance is unanſwerable, 'Whether any Prayer is heard by God, but what is put by his Spirit?

I *Anſwer*, Nay, but Servants and Pious Gentiles, ſuch as *Cornelius* was in his Gentile ſtate, may be, and are helped to Pray by the Spirit, having the Influence of the firſt Miniſtration of the Spirit, which though remotely Preparatory, yet doth not inſtate the Soul into union with the Spirit, that being reſerved for the ſecond Miniſtration of the Spirit, that is more noble, and enableth the Soul that hath it, not only to Pray more effectually and acceptably, but alſo to perform all other Acts of Love and Obedience. And were not my Adverſaries extream blind and ignorant, they might underſtand how the Apoſtle calleth one and the ſame Spirit, in them who are but Servants, *the Spirit of ſervitude* (ſo the Greek) and in them who are Sons, *the Spirit of Adoption* Rom. 18. 5. And elſewhere he diſtinguiſheth thus, calling the one the *Spirit of Fear* and the other the *Spirit of Power, of Love, and of a Sound Mind*, 1. Tim. 1. 7. Which are thus diſtinguiſhed, not in Nature and Being, but in Office. And here let it be noted, how by theſe mens arguing, *That Men may be eternally ſaved, perfectly ſanctified, and endued with the Holy Ghoſt, who have no Faith or Knowledge of Chriſt without them*; do ſufficiently declare what Heathens they are, and of what little value they make the Faith and Knowledge of Chriſt crucified, and that their Religion is nothing but *Deiſm*, under a Mask & Diſguiſe of a Chriſtian Profeſſion.

Fourthly, They make it an Inconſiſtency and Contradiction in me, to have ſaid, *pag.* 12. 'That many who never had the Scriptures, if they have been faithful unto 'God, in what he hath revealed unto them, by the Light of Chriſt in them; who 'dare or can ſay, that they have not been accepted, yet not without Faith in Chriſt 'in ſome meaſure; for they that believe in the Light, believe in Chriſt, who is that 'Light. Citing *Reaſon Corrected*, pag. 150. But where is my Contradiction here? Did I ever ſay, That men may believe in the Light, or Chriſt within, and never at any time from firſt to laſt believe in Chriſt without, either *expreſly*, or *implicitly*: For this they bring no proof, and I believe they can bring none.

Fifthly, In pag. 26. they moſt Ignorantly and Antichriſtianly blame my ſound Chriſtian Aſſertion, where I ſay, 'The work of Sanctification is aſcribed in Scripture to Chriſt's Blood and Sufferings, as well as to his Inward Appearance, and

'to both indispensably necessary, and to Faith therein. Thus we see plainly they place all upon Christ within, and nothing upon Christ without. O bold Antichristianism! published in the Face of a Nation professing Christianity: But wherein I have contradicted that Assertion, they show not.

Sixthly. They bring me in guilty of a Contradiction, for saying, 'Nor is the outward Name that which saveth, but the inward Nature, Virtue and Power signified thereby, which was made manifest in them *&c.* But they no where shew how I contradict this. I say still, It is not the outward Name either of God, or Christ, that saveth, without the Inward Nature, Virtue and Power; which Inward Nature, Virtue and Power, dwelt and dwells in all Fullness in the Man *Christ Jesus*, and of whose fullness we all receive, and Grace for Grace; and all that believe in him, who hath the fullness, they receive rich supplies out of his Fulness daily of more Grace; which they that do not believe in him, do not receive.

Seventhly. They charge me with Contradiction, because formerly I said, 'That 'these *Gentiles* had the Gospel preached unto them, who were not under any outward 'Administration of the Gospel. But they bring no place to prove where I contradict this Assertion, as I do not at present contradict it, but own it in a true sense; and the former Distinction will serve here, of *express* and *implicit*, and I still grant, that the Gospel *implicitly* is Preached to all Men, in some measure, after some sort (*Samuel Fisher* calls it a Gospel-Dram, somewhere in his *Rusticus ad Academicos*, as I have read it in him) but few have obeyed it, as so preached; but whoever did obey it, I question not, but they were accepted. But here let it be Noted, that whereas they would divert the Main Part and Branch of the Question which was and is betwixt them and us, of the Necessity of our Faith in *Christ crucified* to our Salvation, who are professed Christians, wholly to the Case and State of the Gentiles, who have it not outwardly Preached to them by the Ministry of Men, or Books, I have sufficiently proved against them at our late Meeting at *Turner's-Hall*, 11th. of the 4th. Month, 1696. And in the printed *Narrative*, that they have affirmed, *That it is not necessary to our Salvation, to believe that Christ dyed for us*, &c. This Charge lyeth at their Door, which is the main Thing in Question. But how the most Pious and Upright among the *Gentiles* were saved by Faith in Christ Crucified, who had not Faith outwardly Preached, is neither the great or chief Question, nor so proper for us to determine, seeing God hath ways to have done it, unknown to us, whose Ways are above our Ways, as the Heavens are above the Earth; and it may be one of these Secret things that belong to God, and not to us, till he please to reveal it.

Eighthly, pag. 30. They charge me with a Contradiction, for saying, 'He (Christ) 'left not the other Nations destitute of the *Main and Principal Thing*, even the Ma-'nifestation of the Light, *&c.* which would have given them the Knowledge of God, *&c.* But if they think, or would have others to think, that by the *Main and Principal Thing*, I meant the Light within, compared with Christ without, in whom all fulness of Light and Grace dwelleth, they both deceive themselves and seek to deceive others; For by my following Words, it is manifest, I call the Light within the Main Thing, in Comparison with outward Things, as is plain from my following words, cited by them, out of my Book, pag. 12. *Universal Grace*, and not in Comparison with Christ without, in whom the Fulness of Light dwells.

As for their suggestion of my holding the Revolution of Humane Souls, in pag. 31. and more particularly in pag. 3. of *G. Whitehead's* Postscript, who calls it my Notion of Twelve Revolutions of Humane Souls, they have rendred themselves so foolishly impertinent as well as malicious, thinking thereby to cast a great Odium upon me, for holding such an odd Opinion, that I need say little or nothing in answer to them, having so fully and plainly in the openness of my Heart answered to that Charge,

Charge, in my Printed Treatiſe, called, *Truth and Innocency Defended*, in Anſwer to *John Delavall*, who was one of the firſt that charged me with the ſame, and ſince that, no leſs than Four ſeveral Perſons have charged me with it in Print, whereby they have ſufficiently manifeſted both their Folly and Malice, beſides the many Whiſperings and Mutterings they have uſed, and ſpread abroad againſt me, far and near on that account, their Folly is ſufficiently manifeſted, that not one of all my Accuſers have brought the leaſt Authentick Evidence againſt me, to prove their Charge. And as I have fully cleared my ſelf in the caſe, in my Anſwer above-mentioned, Printed at *Philadelphia* ſome Years ago; ſo in my Appendix to the Book, called, *The General Hiſtory of the Quakers*, lately Printed at *London*, in this Year 1696. But let us hear G. W. his Evidence, to prove his Charge againſt me: He ſaith, *That I argued from theſe Scriptures*, John 11. 9. Pſal. 90. 4. 2 Pet. 3. 8. *and ſome others, If I miſtake not*, ſaith he, (Is this like Infallible *George Whitehead*?) *If he ſays I do, let him give us a plain State of his own Opinion herein.* Now would ſuch an imperfect and lame Evidence paſs current before any Judicatory, *The thing is ſo and ſo, if I miſtake not.* And as to the Manuſcript he mentions that I ſhewed him; it is true, there was ſuch a Manuſcript, which I read both to him and *George Fox*, wherein I did undertake to Anſwer to ſome Objections againſt the Univerſal Principle; and there were ſome things in that Manuſcript modeſtly propoſed, concerning the Revolutions of ſome Souls, but no ways as any poſitive Concluſion, but ſimply as an Hypotheſis, or Suppoſition; and if ſuch a Manuſcript, or the Contents of it were ſuch a Crime in G. K. to render me an Apoſtate, and gone from Truth, why did not *G. Whitehead* before twelve Years paſt, (for ſo long ago it is ſince that Manuſcript was read to him) deal with me, by giving me Goſpel-Order, ſince what I had writ in that Manuſcript was ſo offenſive to him, after his telling me my Fault in private, and I not amending, ſhould he not have obſerved Chriſt's order to have taken with him one or two more, *Matth.* 18. 6. And if I did neglect to hear them, to tell it to the Church, that they might have dealt with me. But he having done none of this (only ſhowing ſomewhat of his private diſſatisfaction with the Hypotheſis, which he could not charge upon me as poſitive, as neither he did) Is not he much more blame-worthy? and hath he not brought a great Reflection on himſelf, and alſo on *George Fox*, that they did ſo Connive at my ſuppoſed great Error, and ſo long, yea, and for all that time thereafter to own me as a Friend in Truth, as they both did, and writ to me from *England* to *America*, calling me *dear George Keith* (yea, *G. Fox* in his Letter, particularly deſired me to viſit Friends in *New-England*, and to travel in the Service of Truth in that Country; as accordingly I did) until now, that *G. Whitehead* hath riſen up againſt me, and raiſed up alſo many with him againſt me, for no other Cauſe, as is well known, but for oppoſing the Vile Errors I found among them, both there in *America*, and here in *England*. And whereas ſome in Print and *George Whitehead* in writing has accuſed me of Hypocriſie, for having formerly called him *dear George Whitehead*, and ſince that I have changed my thoughts concerning him; If it be no Hypocriſie in him, to have formerly called me ſo, and yet now to have other thoughts of me; why ſhould he make it hypocriſie in me, to have done but that to him, which he hath done to me? Doth not this prove him guilty of Hypocriſie with a witneſs. But leaving *G. Whitehead* a while, let me return a little to the Book.

Poſtſcript, pag. 32. When they cannot by fair and direct means, prove their charge againſt me, to render me odious, they eſſay to do it by unfair, that is by their Conſequences, not ſo much from my Words, but from the Words of Scripture, as from my ſaying, in *Truth Advanced*, pag. 23. *As it is obſerved by ſome, neither Adam, nor any of his Poſterity, living a compleat Thouſand Years, which in Scripture ſignifies ſometimes a Day, Pſal. 90. It may be ſaid, he lived not a whole Day*: 'Now (ſay they)

'that

that this is a Principle of the Revolutioniſts, is plain to all that know their Principles and that it is his alſo, is manifeſt. But what a lame Evidence and Argument is this, let all Intelligent Perſons judge; If they had ſaid, It is the alone Principle of the Revolutioniſts, and proved it ſo, they had argued ſomewhat to the purpoſe. Sure I am *Juſtin Martyr* held it, for I have read it in him; Doth it therefore follow that he was a Revolutioniſt? If it doth, then the Notion of the Revolutions is not ſo great a Crime, as to render a Man an Apoſtate, or gone from Truth: And not only *Juſtin Martyr*, but many others, Worthy, Antient, and late Chriſtian Writers have held the ſame Principle, that a thouſand Years in Scripture ſometimes ſignifies a Day, and particularly the renowned L. *Neper* of *Marcheſton*, in his Expoſition on the *Revelation*. Surely theſe Men have greatly miſſed their aim, who thinking to diſgrace and reproach me with the Revolutions, by allowing me ſo good company, Men highly eſteemed for their Chriſtian Piety, have rather contrary to their Deſigns, greatly honoured me; but Malice is always Blind, and throws its Poſſeſſor into the Ditch, he makes for another. And if the reckoning a Thouſand Years for a Day, prove the Revolutions, I ſhall not only have the above-named worthy Perſons for my Companions, but *David*, or (as others think *Moſes*, ſee the Title of that *Pſalm*) and *Peter*, who both ſo reckoned *Pſalm* 90. 4. compared with 2 *Pet.* 3. 8. But that theſe Men may ſtill give me more good Company, they will needs have *Paul* to bear me company in the Notion of the Revolutions, and long after him *Beza*, a Renowned Man among *Proteſtants*, both for Piety and Learning: for thus they argue from my Words, or rather the Words of *Paul* and *Beza*'s Tranſlation, pag. 42. *Truth Adv.* 'Who are under the Law, and obey it, according to what their Ability doth reach, 'they are held there as in a Cuſtody, or Place of Safety, as the Man ſlayer in the 'City of Refuge, in the time of the Law, till the Faith came to be revealed. *This 'Word*, (ſay they) *till the Faith came to be revealed*, is a plain Indication of his No-'tion, though he dare not defend it; for they dying in this City of Refuge (ſay they) 'when ſhould the Faith be revealed to them, except in ſome other Revolu-'tion. Now that they make *Paul* and *Beza* equally alike guilty with me, in the caſe of the Revolutions, will be plain, if the Words of *Paul*, *Gal.* 3. 22. 23. be but well conſidered. Let us look back a little to the 19th. Verſe, *Wherefore then ſerveth the Law, it was added becauſe of Tranſgreſſions, till the Seed ſhould come, to whom the Promiſe was made.* [This Seed was Chriſt, according to the Fleſh, together with the Spiritual Bleſſings of Life that accompanied him] Then Verſ. 22. *But the Scripture hath concluded all under Sin*, (not only *Jews*, but *Gentiles*, who had no other Law, but the Law within) *that the promiſe by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt might be given to them that believe. But before Faith came, we were kept under the Law*, [Note, *Beza* doth excellently well tranſlate it, according to the Greek, *ſub legis præſidio* in his Latin Tranſlation, *i. e.* Under the ſafeguard of the Law we were kept] *ſhut up unto the Faith which ſhould afterwards be revealed.* Where a manifeſt Alluſion is made, or rather a real Expoſition, by way of Anti-Type, anſwering to that Old Teſtament-Type of the Man-ſlayer, that was kept ſafe in the Cuſtody of the City of Refuge, though as a Priſoner, or confined, until he heard of the Death of the High Prieſt. Now let the Intelligent Reader judge, whether there be any real difference in Senſe betwixt *Paul*'s Words, *Unto the Faith which ſhould afterwards be revealed*, and my Words, *Till the Faith come to be revealed*; and if my Words infer the Revolutions, do not *Paul*'s Words infer them as much, or rather more? he uſing the Word *afterwards*, which I uſe not. Well, if they judge me guilty of the Revolutions, and condemn me to be an Apoſtate, and gone from Truth on that account, while they give me ſo good Company, as *Moſes*, *David*, *Peter* and *Paul*, I need not fear great Reproach to fall on me for the ſame. But in very deed, they ſaid well, that I dare not defend it, as I never did; but this not daring to defend it, did not proceed in me, nor

nor doth from fear of being defamed; for if I were perſwaded and aſſured of it, as I am of the great Truths of the Chriſtian Faith, I ſhould not fear to avouch it. But ſeeing I pretend to no ſuch aſſurance in the caſe, as I never did, nor ever was poſitive to conclude it ſo much as in my ſecret thoughts, therefore I let it alone, neither juſtifying nor condemning what I have no certain knowledge of. And but that it would be too tedious a digreſſion, and not ſo proper here I could eaſily ſhew how weak their Arguments are againſt it, as it is common to them as well as others, to uſe weak Arguments to defend Truth, and oppoſe what they call Errour. And let them make the worſt of it they can, ſuppoſe that twelve Years ago, moſt of which time ſince they have owned me in Unity with them, I was in an Error in holding the Revolutions, will that prove I hold them ſtill? And ſeeing they judge me changed greatly in my Principles of late Years, why may they not judge me alſo changed in that? Or what ground have they to think I am not? If they ſay, becauſe I have not cleared my ſelf of the Charge: I ſay, I have done it ſufficiently ſeveral times in Print, and oft by Word of Mouth. That I hold it not either as any Article of the Chriſtian Faith, or as any poſitive Dogma in Philoſophy; yet I dare not, nor will not poſitively condemn it univerſally, until I ſee better and ſtronger Arguments than they have as yet brought againſt it. And if it be ſo great and dangerous an Error, why do they not refute it in Print, and Anſwer to all theſe things brought in favour of it, as a probable Hypotheſis in the 200 Queries, which hath been in Print upwards of 12 Years? For they have Scribled and Printed many Books, on Matters far leſs material than this is. But ſince *G. Whitehead* hath Printed that which I committed to him as a Secrecy, without my Conſent, its well it was no ſuch Matter as might have brought any real Infamy on me, its too probable if he could have revealed any Secret that would have taken away my Life, he would have done it. But I had no ſuch Secret to impart to him, or any, that I need be afraid or aſhamed for their revealing it.

Pag. 33. In their Head on the Glorified Bodies of Chriſt and the Saints, they are Guilty of ſuch groſs Perverſions, as none but Men infatuated would be: They infer, 'That I have very Carnal Conceptions of the Reſurrection at preſent, like thoſe 'Sadduces, *Matth.* 22. 29. And why? Becauſe I ſay in *Truth Adv.* pag. 11. *Paul* 'diſtinguiſheth between the Belly and the Body, ſaying, *God will deſtroy the Belly*, 'but he doth not ſay he will deſtroy the Body; for ſeeing after the Reſurrection of 'the Dead, Men ſhall need none of the Meats of this corruptible World, nor ſhall 'they need a Belly to put them in, as Guts, and Draught, or any groſs parts as 'Men have now.

Let the *Reader* obſerve theſe mens Infatuation and Nonſenſe: Do theſe Words prove, that I have Carnal Conceptions of the Reſurrection, like thoſe *Sadduces*? Did not the *Sadduces* altogether deny the Reſurrection? But doth my ſaying, that after the Reſurrection of the Dead, they ſhall need neither Belly, Guts, nor Draught, nor any groſs parts, prove that they ſhall have them? O aſtoniſhing Blindneſs! And they are again guilty of the ſame Perverſion, or rather downright Forgery, in their pag. 34. *ad finem*, by their moſt falſe inſinuating againſt me, as if I did hold, 'That the Reſurrection-Bodies of the Saints ſhall have Belly, Guts 'and Draught: For (ſay they) had G. K. retained theſe Sentiments (of Spiritual 'Bodies) when he wrote his bulky Book, ſtiled *Truth Advanced*, he needed not 'have told us of Belly, Guts, and Draught. But how did I tell them, that Men after the Reſurrection ſhall have them? By no means, but that they ſhould not have them, becauſe they ſhall have no need of them; and ſurely what they need not, they ſhall not have; as *not to need*, in Scripture-phraſe, is *not to have*, Rev. 21. 23. But that I remain in my Ancient Faith of the Reſurrection-Body as formerly, is clear from that very Book, cited by them, to wit, That the Body that is raiſed

ſhall

shall be a Spiritual Body, not gross material Flesh, but wonderfully changed in manner and condition, yet retaining the same Substance, the Husk or drossy part excepted; see particularly pag. 113, and 119. *ad finem.* And that this was my Faith thirty Years ago, is evident from my Answer to the 30 Queries of the Bishop of *Aberdene* abovementioned, and particularly noticed in the Collection of *R. Barclay's* Books, called *Truth Triumphant*, pag. 2. In which Answer that was extant thirty Years ago, I expresly say, in answer to the Bishop's Question, which was, *Shall that same Body in Substance which dyeth, be raised again at the last Day?* Answer, Yea, as far as a Natural Body, and Spiritual Body is the same: It is sown a Natural Body, it is raised a Spiritual Body. Where it is plain, I both believed and declared, it shall be the same Body in Substance that dyeth, and shall be raised, though wonderfully changed in Condition and Quality from Natural to Spiritual. And this Answer was given in the Year 1666. being the third Year after I came among the *Quakers*, and which I gave, conform to *John Crook's* Words in his *Truths Principles*, wherein I judged him (before ever I saw him) to be of the same Mind and Faith with me, in that great Article of the Christian Faith, as well as in others; and since that, I have spoke with him, and had it from his own Mouth.

Pag. 35. As to their 9th Head, concerning Water-Baptism and the Supper, whereon they spend seven pages, reciting some Passages in my former Books, with their Uncharitable Observations, and they are at great pains to show an Inconsistency and Contradiction betwixt my former Books, and my late Book, called *Truth Advanced*, in reference to Water-Baptism, and the Supper, and that from some few Queries I proposed at the end of that Book, only proposed by way of Query, and not as Positive Conclusions; for I expresly distinguish them from the Positive Conclusions going before, being each ten in number. And as to the Ten Positions, I judge many or most called *Quakers*, of the more intelligent sort will stand by them, and may well enough own them, without any Inconsistency to their former Principles. And here I appeal to the Impartial Readers, whither it be not great disingenuity in them, to charge these Queries (simply proposed by me as Queries, but plainly distinguished from Positions) upon me, as plain Positions when to some of their unsound Assertions expressed as Queries, but whose plain Sense did import them to be Positions, they have made that excuse, They did but Query, as lately at *Turners Hall* some of *G. Whitehead's* Advocates did plead in his behalf. *Is this to do as they would be done by?* And how extreamly Uncharitable they show themselves, not to me only, but to all *Christendom*, in so severely accusing me, for my Charitable Title to these Queries, saying —— tending to Love, Peace, and Unity among all the Sincere Professors of the *Lord Jesus Christ*, who hold the Head, and build on the true Foundation, and yet differ in some lesser matters, they so severely tax me for this, as by their Censure it is evident, they think none such to be found in all *Christendom*, but themselves, who hold the Head, and build on the true Foundation: for thus they say, *Which whosoever pleases to believe the reading on, will see whose Communion he labours to insinuate himself into next, as holding the Head, and only differing in some lesser Matters.* But unless they be so Unchristianly uncharitable, (as they too evidently show they are) as to judge none in *Christendom* differing from them in Profession, to hold the Head, or are sincere Professors of the Lord Jesus Christ, but they only) why should I be blamed for owning my Christian Communion with them, in things that are not simply unlawful? Ought I not to be of *David's* Mind, who said, *I am a Companion of all them that fear thee?* &c.

But more particularly as to the Case of *Water-Baptism*, and the *Supper*, as I have freely declared of late Years, *viva voce*, so now as freely I publish it in Print, *That* I am not ashamed to own my general Mistakes I have been under concerning divers Places,

Places of Scriptures, particularly relative to Water-Baptism and the Supper, as *Matth.* 28. 19. and 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. and some other places of Scripture, relative to some other matters, especially in the Misapplication of some places, to prove certain Truths, which these places did not prove, (a thing but too common to many Writers, and to none more than to some called Quakers) for though every place of Scripture prove some Truth, yet every place proves not that Truth in particular which some may bring for to prove it; and I am so far from being ashamed to publish this Confession, that I have great Peace and Joy in it; and I also declare, that I am justly ashamed, that I have been so long deceived and byassed with such weak Arguments, as both they called Friends and I have used, (being too much influenced and byassed by their pretended authority) to perswade and draw away the Minds of People from the true Sense of these places of Scripture. And the Arguments that we have mostly used against these two things, are so weak, that they have the same force against the Bible it self, and all Books and outward Testimonies, and outward acts of Worship, and therefore are void in themselves; for seeing they have no force against the latter, they have as little against the former. However I continue in my faithful Testimony against the abuse of these things, and the dead, empty and formal way that too many practise them; and except the Lord be found to bless and accompany them who use them, with his Power and Spirit, they are but as empty Shadows, and Shells: But who find the Lord to bless them with his Presence, I judge them not; and in this I am not singular, for divers of good Note among the People called Quakers, even Preachers, have said the same, or equivalent, as particularly *John Crook*, and *Robert Barclay*: And it can no more be an evidence of my Apostacy, to correct my former Mistakes on these two places of Scripture, *Matth.* 28. 19. and 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. Which mistakes of mine, were, That I judged the Apostles were not commanded to practise these things, and did not practise them by Command, but by Permission, of which I am now convinced of the contrary, more than it will prove *John Crook* an Apostate, which they will not dare to say, who hath owned the same, *viz.* 'That the Apostles and Primitive Believers did do these things by Command. And *J. N.* in his *Love to the Lost*, hath said as much: Yea, both *J. N.* and *Stephen Crisp*, allow the practise of the *Supper* at this Day to weak Believers, as is evident from their Books in Print.

Pag. 43. They blame me for opposing it as an Error, That the Garden of Paradise was some part of this visible Earth; and for my saying the *Hebrew* Word translated *to dress*, signifies to Work in it, blaming my saying, 'It cannot be well understood that it needed Dressing after the manner of our common Gardens. Now whereas *G. Whitehead* hath approved this Book, and boasts that I have fallen into other Hands to deal with me, *&c.* Let us see how their Hands at present agree: Ye see they blame me for opposing it as an Error, that the Garden of Paradise was some part of this Visible Earth, and will needs have that it needed Dressing, after the manner of our common Gardens. But in plain Contradiction to this, *G. Whitehead* in his Printed Book, called, *A Serious Account, in* 35 *Reasons*, &c. Gives this as one of his 35 Reasons, why the People called Quakers have left the Men called Priests, pag. 23. *Reas.* 9. 'Also the Priests Ignorance and Gross Darkness (saith he) hath 'appeared, who have affirmed, *That the forbidden Fruit*, which the Serpent tempted 'Eve to eat of, *was an Apple*: From which Dream of theirs the picture of a Snake, 'and an Apple in its Mouth in a Tree, with the Image of a Man a Woman, are set 'up at the beginning of Bibles, and in many other places; from which some have 'imagined that the Serpent which beguiled *Eve* was a Visible Creature or Beast of 'the Field, which for that time had power to speak, and to present an Apple to deceive *Eve* withal; when as God said to Man and Woman before the Fall, *Behold I have given you every Herb, bearing Seed, which is upon the face of all the Earth; and* 'every

'*every Tree, in the which is the fruit of a Tree yielding Seed, to you it shall be for Meat,*' Gen. 1. 29. and the fruit of such a Tree that beareth seed, is an Apple; So that could not be the Forbidden Fruit. And the Serpent was that which tempted Man from the Simplicity of the Truth, and through subtilty led him out from the Innocency and Life (wherein God had placed him) to feed upon the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, which was desirable to the Carnal, or Woman's part, that was not content with the pure, innocent and simple Being wherein God at first placed Man over the rest of the Creation.' Now if the Trees of the Garden were not visible, and particularly the Tree of the forbidden Fruit, as G. W. saith it was not, then to be sure the Garden by his judgment was not visible, as an Apple, or any other visible Fruit growing on this visible Earth; and seeing he gives this as a Reason, why he left the Men he calleth Priests: And it is now his own Faith, by the same Reason, all the Quakers should leave him. In the next place, let us hear what *G. Fox* saith in that famous Book, called his *Journal*, pag. 17. *ad finem*. 'Now (saith he) was 'I come up in Spirit through the Flaming Sword into the Paradise of God, all things 'were new, &c. I appeal to all Intelligent Readers, whether *G. F.* did mean by the Paradise or Garden, here any part of this Visible Earth? And if any think, he meant it of any part of this visible Earth; What that part was? unless they will say, it was that Mountain in *Yorkshire*, he mentions, where he had his Vision; but surely that could not be Paradise, for the Barrenness of it. A third Evidence for me and against these Men that have given out this Book, is *William Shewen*, a great Man among them, lately deceased, who to perswade us of his Infallibility, hath told us, *Treatise of Thoughts*, pag. 14. 'That he cannot write contrary to Scripture, being in 'unity with them.' And pag. 19, 20. plainly tells us, 'That the Man was not de-'ceived with the Beauty of an Apple, or *some other outward Fruit*, nor by the Talk or 'Perswasion of any Creature, like our English Snakes, as vain Man in his carnal Mind 'imagins.' So we see his Censure of *G. Whitehead* and *J. Pennington*, that they are vain, who have so imagined in their Carnal Minds. How *G. Whitehead* will clear himself of this and many other gross Self-contradictions, I leave to the Tryal.

Pag. 36. Their Abuse and Perversion is manifest, in seeking to fix a Contradiction on me, for affirming in my Book, *Help in time of Need*, 'That the Scriptures 'are not that Word, [to wit, that living essential Word] more than a Map or De-'scription of *Rome* or *London*, is *Rome* or *London*; or the Image of Cæsar is Cæsar, 'or Bread and Wine is the Body and Blood of Christ.' And for Querying, *Truth Advanced*, Que. 5. 'Whether it may not be said, there is one Baptism, as that there 'is one Land called *America*, though the Map or Figure of it is also called *America*, 'even as there is but one Spiritual Baptism, with the Holy Ghost, though the out-'ward Baptism with Water is also called Baptism.' Now beside that this last is only a Query, but let it pass for a Position, let the Intelligent judge what Contradiction is here, or least Inconsistency. Contradictories can never be true, but both these are true. 1. The Scriptures are not that Living and Essential Word, which is Christ, this is a Truth that all called *Christians* acknowledge: But that they may be called the Word, as a Map of *America* is called *America*, I never denyed; but have oft said, and which is agreeable to many *Protestant* Writers, who have used such a phrase, a Map or Scheme of the Gospel. Nor is the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ, though it be so called: Now if these Men deny this to be a Truth, they must hold with *Papists*, that the Bread and Wine is really the Body and Blood of Christ. 2. That though there is but one Spiritual Baptism, yet that the outward Baptism with Water, is also called *Baptism*, is also true; for *John*'s Baptism with Water is called in Scripture the Baptism of *John*. And after they have thus shown their own Folly and Ignorance, in a scoffing Spirit, they call me *Rabby*, though its the known way of the Quakers not to call a Man *Master*, that is in Hebrew *Rabbi*, *Matth.* 23. 7, 8. Yet to indulge

dulge a Scoffing Humour, they will transgress their Rule. *Here his Rabbi* (say they) *hath foiled himself sorely.* But let the Intelligent judge, whether they have not foiled themselves sorely all along their abusive and scandalous Book, that [excepting these Sound Passages and Testimonies, they have collected out of my Books, which greatly make for me, and show that I am constant in my Principles, as to the Faith of Christ] contains little else, than a heap of Falsities, and Perversions. But that they say, *He once boasted* (*in his* Serious Appeal) pag. 29. *That he hath the Gifts both of Sound Knowledge and Expression, with manifold other Mercies bestowed on him:* In this they falsly accuse me, for there is nothing in that place, that either expresses or implyeth any boast in the least. For whereas my Opponent had charged me with marvelous Ignorance, Falshood and Giddiness I said [among other things] I doubt not but judicious and impartial Readers, who compare his Books and mine, will have another judgment concerning me, and acknowledge to God's praise, the Gifts both of Sound Knowledge and Expression, with his manifold other Mercies bestowed on me, for which I desire to Praise him forever. But to make it look like a Boast, they leave out these last Words, and also the foregoing Words; and its evident I used these Words only Comparatively, and not Absolutely; for I never judged my self absolutely Infallible, nor have been a Self-Praiser, as too many of them are; and I may now say, let their Books who have appeared against me of late, as *W. Penn, G. Whitehead, T. Ellwood*, and others be compared with mine, and I doubt not but judicious and impartial Readers will have another judgment concerning me, than these my prejudiced Adversaries, and acknowledge to God's Praise, the Gifts of sound Knowledge and Expression that God hath given me, for which I desire forever to Praise him; but this I understand only Comparatively, for I never had such thoughts of my self, nor have, but that the Sentiments of my Mind, and Expressions of my Mouth and Pen, in divers things, may admit of Correction, though as to the main, every true Christian as well as I, may say, We have a Sound Knowledge and Faith. And whereas they pass another Scoff upon me, pag. 34. calling my Book, *Truth Advanced*, His bulky Book; which is but of small bulk in comparison of the bulky Volumns of *G. Whitehead, W Penn*, and divers others: I am not doubtful to say, that Intelligent Readers who compare their great bulky Books with that one small bulky Book of mine, will say, there is more Sound matter of Doctrine in it, and the Contents of it are more for Edification, than in their great bulky Books: Yet I have been so modest (a thing I never found in any of them) to acknowledge, that in some things I may receive some Correction, and better Information. See my Pref. *Truth Adv.* pag. 45.

Pag. 44. They quarrel my expounding 'Adam and Eve's hiding themselves 'among the Trees of the Garden, to be in a Tree of the Garden, and that one Tree 'may be well understood, to be the divine Mercy or Clemency.

I had said in my Book, *Truth Adv.* the Hebrew doth bear it, *in a Tree of the Garden*, pag. 25. But I must excuse their Ignorance in the Hebrew, that they will not admit of this true Translation: And are they not Carnally Minded, to think that *Adam* thought he could hide himself either among the Trees of an outward Garden, or in any one Tree of it, so as God might not see him; this is to think, at least, that *Adam* was an *Anthropomorphit* or *Muggletonian*, as having such a gross Opinion, that God had bodily Eyes as a Man, and that an outward Tree could hide him from God. And their Argument is as foolish, against my saying, 'That Tree might be 'the Divine Mercy or Clemency. They say, *The Divine Mercy is in Christ Jesus, and if they were got there, when they heard the Voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden, they should not have been afraid, for they were already safe.* But doth not the Scripture say, God's Mercies are over all his Works? and doth not the Clemency and Mercy of God extend to them that are not yet in Christ? have they not

 that

that understanding, to distinguish betwixt the Mercy of God in general to all Men; and his Mercy in special to Believers; and seeing they will needs have this Place where *Adam* hid, some outward Trees on this Earth, by the same Carnal Mind they must understand, that this walking of God, was an outward and Bodily walking, and his Voice an outward and Bodily Voice: and so they make not only *Adam*, but *Moses* who writ these Words, to be an *Anthropomorphit* and *Mugletonian*, or rather the Father and Founder of the Anthropomorphits and Mugletonians; for *Mugleton* himself draweth his Arguments from his Carnal Understanding of these Places, as these Men do.

Pag. 44 They also blame me, for saying, *Adam* and *Eve*'s Nakedness was the fruit of Transgression. And they argue against it, by Quering, *What Sign or Token of Impudence is it in People to endeavour to cover their Nakedness.*

I *Answer*; Taking Nakedness Metaphorically, as I do in that place, *Gen.* 2. as it is taken, *Rev.* 3.17,18. It is a sign of Impudence to endeavour to cover their Nakedness: Have not some called *Quakers* gone naked through the Streets, as a sign of the People's Nakedness: And what Nakedness was that? Is not Sin a Nakedness, metaphorically taken? and when Men cover their Sins, with false and sinful Excuses, it is a sign of their Impudence, as is too manifest in these men, *George Whitehead* and *John Pennington*. And what Nakedness was that of the Serpent, *Gen.* 3. 1. for as I said in *Truth Adv.* p. 25. the Hebrew Word is the same in both places, viz. *Gen.* 2. 25. and 3. 1. Was it bodily Nakedness that he wanted some outward Garment to cover it? And can we suppose, that God who cloatheth every Lily of the Field, made *Adam* without a suitable Cloathing; Did he not Crown him with Glory and Honour? *Psal.* 8. 5. And if his Head was not naked, how could his Body be naked? But it is not to be supposed, that *Adam's* Cloathing before the Fall was any other than that Beauty and Glory that God had put on him, both with respect to Soul and Body; but this gross Ignorance of these Men here, touching *Adam*'s state before the Fall, is like that of their Ignorant Brother of the Ministry, *Jacob Talner*, who asserted in a late Meeting at *Turner's-Hall*, before some hundreds *That* Adam *before the Fall, had neither Holiness nor Wisdom, nor Righteousness*; and denyed that *either Spiritual or Temporal Death was the effect of* Adam's *Fall*; and used the very same Argument against G. K's Ministry, that the *Papists* used against the People called *Quakers*, and all *Protestant* Ministers, calling for Miracles, or Church-Authority. Another most foolish and ignorant Argument they bring against my saying, God cloathed them inwardly with the Righteousness of the Lamb: They say, *Did he cloath them with the Righteousness of the Lamb, and yet at the same time debar them access to the Tree of Life?* See *Gen.* 3 21, 22. What strange Doctrine is this. But *at the same time* is their addition: If by *the same time*, they mean the same Instant, or Hour: I say nay. But the time was not long betwixt their Fall, and their Restoration, so far as they had access to Christ, signified by the Tree of Life. What they call monstrous Doctrine, of *a Body a top of a Body*, is none of mine, but their own invention, and foolish arguing. Is a Mass, wherein there is a mixture of Gold and Dross, a Body a top of a Body? They quarrel with my Translation, for rendring the Word *Rib* to be *Side*; and though I bring several places of Scripture to prove it a true Translation, they bring nothing to disprove it. Surely a Side of *Adam* bears more proportion for *Adam*'s Wife, than a Rib. *Plato* a Heathen, had a better understanding of Man's state before the Fall, then these Men have, for all their high pretence to high divine Illumination, and they who in their conceit are first in the ranck of Christians, are last in many respects for their extream Ignorance, beyond most Professors of Christianity.

I shall

I shall not need to Notice his idle and impertinent Clamour, against what he calleth my Arbitrary and Extrajudicial Proceedings, and new Court of Judicatory, and as contrary to the intent of the Law, having sufficiently answered it in my Preface to the Printed *Narrative*. But I cannot but observe his great Hypocrisie and Impudence in his saying, *He is not conscious to himself of Error, either in reference to the Resurrection, Christ's Satisfaction, or Sacrifice, or his visible coming again, in his glorified Body without us, to raise the Dead at the Great Day of Judgement.* Seeing I have proved him Guilty in all these things, as manifestly as the Light at Noon-day in the Printed *Narrative*, and in that Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, 11th. 4th. Month, 1696. to which I expect his Answer, before they Print any more. But whereas he accuseth me, That I have dealt very unfairly by him, in leaving out [Blood and Bones] after the Words, Body of Flesh. I *Answer*, There was no unfairness in it, seeing it was no designed Omission, but an oversight either in the Print, or Transcribing; and the adding *Blood and Bones* to the Word *Flesh*, doth not in the least excuse his gross Error. For if Christ did rise with the Substance of his Flesh, so did he with the Substanc of Blood and Bones; for he could not eat and drink after his Resurrection, without Blood in his Body: and if he hath the Substance of his Flesh now in Heaven, though wonderfully changed in Conditon from Animal to Spiritual, surely he hath also the Substance of his Blood [so much as remained in his Body] and also of his Bones. But that he seems, pag. 6. to apply my words, *the Husk*, or *Drossy part*, not the true Body, to Christ's Body; as if I held his Body had any husk or dross in it, is unfair in him, for I hold no such thing, nor ever did.

He is very impertinent and weak in his complaining, That I gave them no Copy of that he falsly calls the Particulars of my Indictment, or Charge before Tryal, or of the Books and Pages referred unto therein for a due preparation to answer, alledging, I would not be so served or surprised. I sent them, and particularly I sent him to his House, a printed Copy of the Advertisement, wherein the Four Heads were particularly expressed, that I charged them with, and which I have made good against them. *G. W.* that professeth so great skill in Law, and has more Law than true Gospel in his Books, knoweth that it is not the manner of Indictments, suppose my printed Advertisement had been such as it was not, to put in the Evidence against the Delinquents or Criminals, and were they armed with Truth and Righteousness, they needed not have complained of want of due preparation (its odd and a new sort of Language for one called a *Quaker*, to tell us of his not being prepared) the Scripture saith (1 Pet. 3. 15.) *Be ready always to give an Answer to every Man that asketh you a Reason of the Hope that is in you.* When I was most falsly and uncharitably accused by *John Vaughton*, *John Field*, and *Thomas Ellwood*, at the Yearly Meeting, 1694. I sought no Particulars of Quotations, and Pages referred unto, nor did any intimate to me before-hand the particular Passages in my Books that they justly excepted against, I intirely relyed on the Assistance of God to help me, what to answer to the many false Accusations and Perversions, that my Accusers used against me, and I found him a present help to me. I had offered in Print before to *Tho. Elwood*, that he would appoint Time and Place, and I would stand to his Appointment: And I make the same Offer to you again, I freely allow you to serve me, as I have served you; Give out your Advertisement in Print, appoint your Time and Place, and let me have your Charge without your Proofs until we meet, and then bring them forth against me; I promise (God permitting) to meet you, provided the Meeting be free and open to all Sober Persons.

F A POSTSCRIPT,

A POSTSCRIPT,

Containing an Earneſt Expoſtulation with the moſt Pious and Learned, whether in the Church of England, *or among other Proteſtant Diſſenters; and a ſerious Invitation unto them, to employ ſome of their Time and Labour, by their Pious and Learned Writings, to oppoſe and refute thoſe vile Errors boldly avowed, and publickly broached, in the late Printed Books of ſome Leading Men among a Gang and ſort of* Quakers.

IT may ſeem ſtrange, how it comes to paſs, that while ſo many Pious and Learned Men are judged to be found in this Nation, not only of the Church of *England*, but among the Diſſenters and Nonconformiſts, there are found ſo few among them all, that do imploy their Gifts to oppoſe ſuch Vile Errors as are boldly and avowedly promoted among a ſort and Gang of the People called Quakers, not only as bad as any Popery, but much worſe than the worſt of Popery, in divers reſpects; and I am confident if ſuch Antichriſtian Errors and Hereſies were but the tenth part ſo avowedly broached in the City of *Rome*, or any where elſe, in Popiſh Countries, theſe eſteemed Watchmen among them, would be more alarmed to oppoſe them by Word and Writing, than moſt among Proteſtants do, which would ſeem to caſt a great Reflexion on the Proteſtant Churches, if ſome able Men, and of good eſteem among them, both for Piety and Sound Knowledge, be not awakened to beſtow ſome of their time and labour by their Writings to oppoſe ſuch Vile Errors; and ſuch a Work would be ſo far from unbecoming the ableſt and moſt valuable Perſons in this Nation, for Piety and Learning, that it would turn much to their Honour and real Advantage, to beſtir themſelves in this Work. It frequently happeneth, that Books are more valued, and the Contents of them the more regarded and conſidered, and the more univerſally read and recommended, that Perſons of publick Note and Fame, when Pious and Learned are the Authors of them.

And whereas many of the chiefeſt Teachers and Leaders among the People called Quakers, have formerly with great boldneſs, provoked ſuch as have differed from them to publick Diſputes, *viva voce*, and have oft gloried over them, who refuſed to anſwer them, that their Cauſe was bad, and that they had not Truth on their ſide; and in theſe days there was no ſuch Cry to be heard from them, as now, That ſuch publick Diſputes will offend Authority, and break the Civil Peace; yea, how oft have ſome of their Teachers aſſaulted the National Miniſters in the Face of their Congregations, and provoked them to diſpute with them; and on their refuſal, have cryed out againſt them to be Fugitives and Hirelings, when the ſaid National Miniſters way of Religion and Worſhip was approved by Authority, and that of the People called Quakers was not: Would it not therefore be a moſt equal, reaſonable, and commendable Practiſe, for any Perſons of true Piety and ſolid Learning, moved with the Zeal of God's Glory, and love of Truth, and with a Holy Indignation againſt theſe Vile Errors that are publickly avouched by ſome Leading Men among

among the Quakers; as appeareth both by their former and later Printed Books, and with a tender Compassion to the Souls of so many Thousands in this Nation, that are in danger to perish by the Infection of these Errors, openly and publickly to call them forth to a publick Hearing, and to press them by earnest Perswasions, to retract and condemn those vile and damnable Errors contained in their Books; or if they continue to justifie them, to refute them openly in the Face of their own Meetings, and in the presence of them that do so much admire and follow them. *And thus to serve them, as they have served others; and with what Measure they have met to others, with the same to mete to them again.* And it would be a Commendable and Praise-worthy thing, for the Civil Authority, to encourage such a Practise throughout the Nation, that Men of true Piety and solid Learning might be allowed and Countenanced to Refute these Vile and Abominable Errors of these chief Teachers and Leaders among them called Quakers, in their Meeting-Houses, at the end of their Meetings, or at other fit times: Surely such a Practise as this, as it is no ways inconsistent with the Civil Peace, and Liberty of Conscience granted to Dissenting Protestants, (notwithstanding of the idle Clamour of such Men, who have an Evil Conscience and a bad Cause) would be more effectual to Preserve the True *Protestant Christian* Religion in these three Nations, than all the severe ways in former times used against them, of Fines, Imprisonments, &c. And though it is far from me to desire the least Sufferings to come on these Mens Persons or Estates, yet if such a Zeal were raised in them bearing Authority in this Nation, to give order that all such Books of them called *Quakers*, as can readily be found, (as great store of such there are) that contain such Vile and Abominable Errors, to the dishonour of the worthy Name of Christ, and the Christian Religion, and the great danger of many Souls, be diligently searched and examined by the most Pious and Judicious Persons in the Nation, and after due search and Examination, be found guilty; that by publick Authority all such Books may be suppressed and witnessed against. I may freely say, these Men should have no just Cause to Complain, that their Books should be so dealt with, for they have done the like to Books that have opposed their gross Errors, witness a Parcel of Books writ (by me) some Four Years ago, that came to *London* from *Pensilvania*, opposing the gross Errors of some called Quakers in that Province, which were designed to have been Sold in single Books, and dispersed through City and Country for a general Service: But the Quakers here at *London* gave large Money to the Man that had them, that they might get them all into their Hands, on purpose to suppress them; as accordingly they did, and hinder the Service of them; and these very Books generally lie in these Mens Custody suppressed unto this very Day, and some of them have burned, others have torn, and trod under Feet in open view, Books that have opposed their vile Errors.

Advertisement.

WHereas there is lately Printed a Scandalous Libel against me, with this Title, *Master* George Keith *at Turners-Hall in* Philpot-*Lane*, London, *in* 1696. *contradicting*, &c. Signed only with two Letters, *W. C.* wherein he laboureth in vain to prove my Inconsistency and Contradiction, betwixt my Book of *Immediate Revelation*, and the late *Exact Narrative*; the Author of which

Scandalous

Scandalous Libel, ſeemeth to profeſs himſelf to be a Member of the Church of *England*, but his Speech bewrayeth him to be a Counterfeit, and rather one of that Gang and ſort of Anti-Chriſt-*Quakers*, above-mentioned, ſeeing he doth ſo eagerly patronize them, againſt the known Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as well as of all true Chriſtians. I give this publick Intimation, that I deſire this *W. C.* to appear and meet me at any convenient time, at our Meeting-place at *Turners-Hall*, which time I allow him to appoint, and give Notice of before-hand; and I doubt not but by God's Aſſiſtance, to prove him guilty of divers Forgeries, and palpable Falſities, Perverſions, and Wreſtings of my Sound Words, contained in his ſaid Scandalous Libel, together with his bafe Reflexions and Falſe Surmiſes againſt me. And if he refuſe this my fair Propoſal it will be manifeſt he is a Cowardly Spirit, and ſmiter in the dark, and as well Unmanly as Unchriſtian, thus in a Clandeſtine way by palpable Falſities and Perverſions, to ſeek to deceive his unwary Readers, and to divert me from a Buſineſs of greater Concern by his trifling. And I judge no Impartial Obſerver of the ſtate of this Controverſie betwixt my open and profeſſed Adverſaries, *G. W.* and *W. P.* and others of their party and me, will think me obliged to Print Anſwers to ſuch Clandeſtine Enemies, and Smiters in the dark, or to regard their Nameleſs Libels, which might prove as much an Unprofitable as an Endleſs Work.

I alſo deſire the Friendly Reader to take notice, that the Corrections and Explanations of ſome Paſſages contained in my former Books (which I have freely declared, did need Correction in ſome things, and Explanation in others) are in great part already given in this Treatiſe; and indeed the greateſt Miſtakes that I find I have been under, were my miſ-underſtanding theſe places of Scripture, *Matth.* 28. 19. and 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. and others the like places relating to theſe outward Practices of *Baptiſm* and the *Supper*, which in the foregoing Treatiſe I have freely acknowledged; and this may ſuffice at preſent to ſilence the Clamour of ſuch that cry out, I ſhould firſt acknowledge my own Errors, before I charge others with their Errors: For as I had done it in general in the firſt place, ſo ſince I have done it in particular in great part, and may yet more fully do it, as God ſhall be pleaſed to give me an Opportunity. But I bleſs God I have no ſuch Errors to retract or correct, as my Adverſaries have; for put all my Miſtakes and Errors together in one Bundle, and they will not weigh the one thouſand part of the weight that one of theſe four Errors do weigh, that I have proved my Adverſaries guilty of, both in the *Exact Narrative*, and in this fore-going Treatiſe, and in other late Treatiſes. And

were

were but my Adverſaries ſo ſincere and ingenuous to acknowledge either in general, or in any particulars wherein they have been miſtaken, and need to correct their Sentiments, it would give great Satisfaction to many, as well as to me. But this they will hardly do, nay, it is impoſſible they can do it, ſo long as they ſeek to keep up in their credulous Followers, their eſteem of their Infallibility; and beſide, to own that they are changed from their former Sentiments, would be either to acknowledge themſelves as great Apoſtates, as they now charge me to be for ſome ſmall change in me, touching leſſer Matters, or rather to clear me of that foul Charge of Apoſtacy they have ſo invidiouſly caſt upon me. And it is great diſ-ingenuity in them, and Hypocriſie, to blame me for ſaying, I did not know they held ſuch Principles, till of late times; for it is certain, that as theſe their Erronious Principles were unknown to me, which I call *Anti-Chriſtian* and *Sadducean*; ſo what they call my *Presbyterian* and *Prieſtly* Principles, were unknown to them; or if they did know them, they were great Hypocrites if they judged them falſe, not to diſcover them before now. For whereas now they commonly ſay I hold Prieſts and Profeſſors Principles; I know no ſuch Prieſts and Profeſſors Principles that I now hold, but I am able to prove, I have held them ever ſince I came among the People called *Quakers*, as touching all the Articles of Faith, commonly called the *ſimpliciter credenda*; and wherein I am changed in my Judgment, as to the Senſe of theſe places of Scripture, relating to Baptiſm and the Supper, I can prove my agreement with ſome of chiefeſt Note among the People called *Quakers*, therefore for that I am no Apoſtate.

Some of the Chiefeſt of theſe Falſe Contradictions, the foreſaid Libeller hath unjuſtly charged upon me, that prove him extreamly Ignorant or wickedly Impudent.

Pag. 5. That an Unbelieving *Jew* is no Chriſtian.

That a Believing *Jew* in *Moſes* time was a *Chriſtian.*

That which makes one a true *Chriſtian*, is the Spirit of Chriſt, the anointing in him.

Faith in Chriſt without us, wrought by the Spirit of Chriſt in us, is univerſally neceſſary to make Men true *Chriſtians.*

Pag. 6. The Hiſtory, or Hiſtorical and expreſs Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt crucified, is not univerſally neceſſary to make Men true *Chriſtians.*

Some Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt crucified (though not the Expreſs and Hiſtorical, yet Implicit) is univerſally neceſſary to make Men true *Chriſtians.*

The Manifeſtation of God in the Fleſh of Chriſt, and his Incarnation, is a greater Myſtery than mens Regeneration.

Chriſt's inward Miniſtry and Teaching by the Spirit in our Hearts, is more than his outward Miniſtring and Speaking was to them who outwardly heard him and ſaw him.

Jeſus

n Pag. 7. Christ crucified in whom the Fulness, dwelleth, is a greater Mystery than Christ in the *Gentiles*.

Jesus Christ revealed in Man is the Foundation of the true Church. *Note*, I did not say Christ only within, &c.

Pag. 8. Christ without us, as he is both God and Man, the *Emmanuel*, as well as his inward Appearance in us, is the Object of Saving Faith.

The Internal Revelation of Christ, is the formal Object of Faith. *Note* His Ignorance, in not understanding the distinction betwixt the *material Object of Faith*, and the *formal Object*, also betwixt the *objectum formale quod*, and *objectum formale quo*, maketh him think the two above-mentioned Passages to be Contradictions; but for his Instruction, I send him to *R. B.* his *Apology* on that Head, and his and my Answer to the Students of *Aberdene*.

Pag. 11. The Wisdom described, *Prov* 8. is Christ the very fulness of God.

Note, His abominable Forgeries and Falsities, in saying, I give all these Names he mentions p 11 to the Light within, which is a notorious Falshood, as the Reader will see, that will be at the pains to view the several pages he refers to; for though some of these Names I give to the Light within, yet not all of them, but some I give to Christ, as he is both God and Man; and I divers times in that same Book, and near to these places that he cites, call the Light within a Measure of that Fulness of Life and Spirit, whose Fulness is in the Man Christ without us.

The Light in us is the Voice of Wisdom, the Path of Wisdom, a Measure of that Fullness. See my Book, *Immediate Revel.* pag. 117. 243, 245.

Mary was the Mother of Christ, according to the Flesh, and in that respect Christ is the Seed of the Woman in the literal sense of *Gen.* 3. 15.

Believers are the Mother of Christ in an Allegorical Sense, not grounded on *Gen* 3. 15. but on *Matth.* 49. 50. and *Rev.* 12. 5. And in this Allegorical Sense, Christ is formed in the Saints, *Gal.* 4. 19. and by his Power in them, he (the Seed of the Woman) bruiseth the Serpent's Head.

And as in all his Instances, he grosly prevaricates, so he is guilty of most gross Forgery in saying, That I Allegorize his Birth [in the Flesh], and his Miracles, Crucifixion and Resurrection. But his Ignorance proceeds from his not understanding to distinguish betwixt an Allegorical Allusion warranted by Scripture, and turning the true Literal Sense of places of Scripture into an Allegory, so as to destroy, or make void the Literal Sense, which I have proved *G. W.* guilty of: But this Libeller *has* proved no such thing on me; and he is most shamefully deceitful, in saying, the Word *away*, we must justly drop on both sides, I having accused *G. W.* that he hath Allegorised away Christ's Births, Burial, Resurrectionn, and proved him guilty of so doing in my *Narrative*, by Allegorising away the Literal Sense of these places of Scripture, *Isaiah* 9. 6, 53. 9. and 1 *Cor.* 15. 8.

London, the 24th. of the Month called *July*, 1696.

G. K.

ERRATA.

Pag. 9. line 29. for *servants* read *parents*. p. 11. l. 17. after *is*, r. *a part in*. p. 22. l. 30. r. *ad finem*. p. 26. l. 11. after *books* r *but think that I did so distinguish*. p. 29. l. 40. r. *desine*. p. 34. last line, for *geneaal* r *several*. p. 35. l 47. r. *Man and Woman*.